B

THE DIOCESANS TRYALL:

WHEREIN

ALL THE SINNEWS OF D. DOVVNAMS Defence are brought unto three heads, and orderly dissolved.

2

By M. PAVL BAYNES.

Imprinted. 1621.

THE
DIOGENES
TRYALS.

268 ; 90

THE PREFACE

MAny writings, and sermons also have cause to wish that the men from whom they come were lesse knowen then they are. For then should they bee free from much prejudice, and finde better acceptance with those that they come to. But I wish nothing more unto this Treatise, which now is comming into the world, then that the Author of it were throughly known unto all those that shall meet with it; for then his worke would need no borrowed commendation, the title it selfe carrying authority with it, even to force respect from every honest Reader, if either the sharpnesse of wit, variety of reading, depth of judgement, aptnesse to teach, holy and pleasant language, heavenly conversation, wise cariage, or any fulnesse of grace will so farre prevaile with him. I doe not abuse good words, or load one with them whom they doe not belong to, as many painters of Sepulchres in their funerall Orations use to doe: but speak that in short, which M. Baines his person did largely preach unto all such as came neere unto him: and that which his incomparable writings will sufficiently witnesse to future generations.

Neither is this all that the Authours qualitie may suggest unto the considerate Reader: but he may arise from this to more important thoughts; especially if the remembrance of M. Baynes his worth doe occasion him to thinke of many others like unto him: such as M. Dearing, M. More, M. Greenham, M. Perkins, M. Rogers, M. Cartwright, M. Fenner, M. Brightman, M. Parker, M. Philips, M. Hieron, & M. Bradshaw &c. to speake nothing of those which yeelding, nor of D. Reinolds, D. Fulk, and D. Whitakers with many others. For all these being apprehended as men agreeing in one spirit, and having had indeed the spirit of glory resting on them, as their workes doe shew, together with those learned tolleo-

niall which they left written in the hearts of many thouſand Chriſtians, it muſt needs cauſe at the leaſt an inquirie, what the reaſon ſhould be, that ſuch famous men of God, could never like well of our Biſhoply courſes in England, nor ever be favoured of them. The caſe is plaine to all: and the cauſe is as evident to thoſe that haue eyes to ſee: but no where more apparant then in the perſon of M. Baines, and the place where hee, and others like him were made ſignes of this antipathie. Cambridge is or ſhould be, as an eye to all our land: ſo that the alterations that fall out there cannot but bee felt of all parts. It is the place of light; the ſpirituall oppreſsions which in other corners are covered with darkeneſſe (as all the works of darkneſſe would be) when paſt all ſhame they come to confront the Sunne it ſelfe, how can they then be hidden?

When M. Perkins had there for many yeares held forth a burning and ſhining light, the ſparkes whereof did flie abroad into all corners of the land, and after he had ſerved his time was taken up into heaven, there was none found ſo meet for to receive, as it were, the torch out of his hand, and ſucceed him in that great office of bearing it before ſuch a people, as this M. Baines, upon whom alſo the ſpirit of that Elias, was by experience found to be doubled. In this ſtation he ſo demeaned himſelfe for ſome years, that impietie onely had cauſe to complaine: for all that favoured the wayes of God, rejoyced and gloried in him and his Miniſterie, as a ſpirituall treaſure. But at length the howre of darkneſſe came from Lambeth, when Arch. Bancroft ſent M. Harſenet to viſite, as they call it, that is (if termes may be interpreted by common practiſe) to picke the purſes of poore men, and to ſuppreſſe thoſe that are not friends to the Biſhops Kingdome. For though in that circuit there were a multitude of unable and notoriouſly ſcandalous Miniſters, yet none were found worthy of cenſure, but onely M. Baynes, of whom the world was not worthy, and one other Preacher like unto him. Now it is hard to ſay, whether the ſilencing of him was more odious, or the manner of it ſhameleſſe. There muſt be a Sermon (yee know) at ſuch viſitations, for faſhion ſake, though the Viſiter himſelfe can ſeldome find leaſure to make it. This part was

therefore appointed to M. Baynes by the Visiters, that he might either be insnared in his words, if he did not apply himselfe to their humours, or else grace their ungracious courses, if he did. But it did not succeed handsomely either way: For he delivered wholesome doctrine appertaining to the present audience, in such warie manner, that no specious occasion could be taken thereby of questioning his libertie. Yet fairely or fouly the mischievous intention must not faile. M. Baines having heat his weake body by straining to speake unto a great audience, retired himselfe presently upon his comming down from the Pulpit to provide for his health, which otherwise would have bene indangered. They in the meane time going on with their bnsinesse, as they are wont in the masterly forme of a muster, called for M. Barnes among the rest, and upon his not answering, though he was not cited thither as to a Court, but onely intreated to preach, as hee did, yet for not appearing, he was immediately silenced. Afterward in deed, the Chancellour being informed of that grosse nullitie, which was in that sentence, urged him about subscription and conformitie; and so to make sure worke, silenced him over againe: In which businesse he was so conscious unto himselfe of unreasonable and ridiculous dealing, that when M. Baynes standing to receive the sentence of a corrupt man, did lift up his heart and eyes unto God with a heavenly smiling countenance, as he used, he interpreted that gesture to be a skorning of his authoritie. This being done, M. Baines was perswaded by his friends to try the Archbishops courtesie, unto whom, when he presented himselfe, at the very first salutation, the gravitie and severitie of B. Bancroft led him sharply to rebuke the good mā for a little blackworke, which was upon the edges of his cuffes, asking him how he durst come before him with such cuffs, telling him very bishoplike, that it were a good turne to lay him by the heeles for so doing. After this he would have no more to doe with such absurd unreasonable men: but preached sometime where he might have libertie, as his weakenesse of bodie would suffer; and spent the rest of his time in reading, meditating, praying and writing, saving that upon occasion he did

instruct or comfort those which came to him in private, wherein he had a heavenly gift. He was indeed all his life after, beside the weakenesse of his bodie pressed with want, not having (as he often complained to his friends) a place to rest his head in: which me thought was an upbraiding of the age and place where he lived with base regardlessnesse of pietie and learning: yet he never so much as consulted with himselfe of denying his sinceritie by pleasing the Bishops, of whom and their courses he was wont to say, *They are a generation of the earth, earthly, and savour not the waies of God.* Which saying of his, they, and some Doctors of Cambridge have since made good, in that they could not indure, that the place from whence they thrust him, should be supplyed by other honest men, though they were conformable, but with absolute authoritie at length forbad it, alledging that Puritanes were made by that lecture: whereas the truth is, that one lecture hath done more good to the Church of God in England, then all the doctors of Cambridge: though I doe not deny, but some of them have wrought a good worke.

By this one instance (of which kind I would there were not a hundred in our land) it may easily appeare to the understanding Reader, that there is as much agreement betwixt our Bishops in their managing of Religion (except some two or three, which went out of their elements, when they ventered on those places) and those powerfull Preachers who haue bene the chiefe meanes of revealing Gods arme unto salvation, as there is betwixt the light which commeth down from heaven, and that thick mist which ariseth from the lowest pit.

But we need not seeke for demonstrations of the spirit which worketh in our Hierarchie from this opposition, look but at the fruits of it, where it hath all fulnesse of consent, as in Cathedrall Pallaces, or Parishes of Bishops and Archbishops residence, such as Lambeth is, where all their canons are in force, and haue their full sway without contradiction: nay come neerer unto them, and take a view of their families, even to them that wayt in their chambers, and see what godlinesse there is to be found. Haue there not more of God and his Kingdome appeared in some one Congregation of those

thoſe Miniſters which they haue ſilenced for vneonformity, then in all the Biſhops families that are now in England? Was there ever any of them that could endure ſuch a Pariſh as Lambeth is, if they had ſuch power of reforming it as the Archbiſhops haue?

To returne therfore vnto our Authour: whilſt he lived a private life, being thus ſtrucken with the Biſhops Planet, he had time to apply his able wit and judgement vnto the diſcuſsing of many queſtions, which if the Prelates had not forced ſuch leaſure vpon him, it may be he would haue paſſed by with others. And among the reſt, by Gods providence hee vvas directed to theſe Eccleſiaſticall Controverſies which concerne our Dioceſan ſtate in England: wherein, as in all other queſtions which he dealt in, he hath ſhewed ſuch diſtinct and pearcing vnderſtanding, together with evidence of truth, as cannot but give good ſatisfaction to him that in theſe things ſeeketh light.

He might in deed haue choſen other particular corruptions to haue vvritten on, if it had bene his purpoſe either to haue taught men, vvhat they daily ſee and feele, or to haue laboured about the branches, and leaue the root vntouched: But it vvas no delight vnto him, for to proue that vvhich no man doubted of, as that the common courſe and practiſe of our Prelates their courts, their urging of ſubſcriptions, with humane ſuperſtitious ceremonies, are preſumptuous inſolencies againſt God and his Church: or prepoſterouſly to begiinne at the end of the ſtreame for to cleanſe the vvater. He choſe rather to ſearch the fountaine of all that foulneſſe vvhervvith our Churches are ſoiled: vvhich he judged to be found in the conſtitutions here in this Treatiſe examined. And if theſe fevv queſtions be vvell conſidered, it vvill appeare that a multitude of pernicious abuſes doe depend on thoſe poſitions vvhich in them are confuted. One fundamentall abuſe in our Eccleſiaſticall oppreſsion is in the diſpoſing of charges, or placing of Miniſters over Congregations: It is called vſually beſtovving of Benefices or Livings, in an earthy phraſe vvhich ſavoureth of the baſe corruption commonly practiſed. For Congregations ought not to be beſtovved on Miniſters,

niſters, but Miniſters on Congregations: the benefit or benefice of the miniſter, is not ſo much to be regarded, as of the Congregation: It is the calling and charge which every Miniſter ſhould looke at, not his living and benefice. Now theſe Benefices are beſtowed ordinarily by the Patron (whether Popiſh, prophane, or religious, all is one) and the Biſhop, without any regard of the peoples call or conſent: ſo as no lawfull mariage is made; no ſervant placed: againſt all Scripture, Councels and ancient examples. Whereby it commeth ordinarily to paſſe, that Lawyers muſt determine of Miniſters callings, after long ſuits and great charges; as if Congregations and Farmes were held by one title and right. And ſometime it is found that the Miniſter is a continuall plague unto his people, living in contention, ſpight and hatred with them, as many law-ſuits doe too too plainely witneſſe. What is the reaſon? Becauſe Pariſhes are eſteemed as no Churches, that ever were ordeined by Chriſt, or recived any power and priviledges from him, but as mans creatures, and by man to be ordered as it pleaſeth him. Another practiſe of like nature with the former, is that the Miniſter being called to one Congregation, becommeth a Pluraliſt by taking another, or more livings, in ſpight of that Congregation, to which hee was firſt and is ſtill perſonally tied. And after all this he may be a non-reſident, abiding or preaching at none of his many livings. Nay he may chop and change, ſell and buy like a marchant, ſo he doe it cloſely; which is ſuch an abomination, as Rome and Trent condemneth, and hell it ſelfe will ſcarſe defend. What is the ground? Becauſe (forſooth) Chriſt hath not appointed Pariſhes, their officers, and offices, and therfore no man is bound further in this kinde, then mens Lawes, canons, cuſtomes, and injunctions doe preſcribe unto them. For a grave Doctor of Cambridge anſwered one that queſtioned him for his groſſe non-reſidencie, *viz.* that Pariſhes were divided by a Pope: inſinuating as it ſeemeth that he accounted it a point of Poperie, for to tie Miniſters unto their particular charges,

A third groſſe corruption is, that the officers in Congregations, Miniſters, Church-wardens, &c. are made ſervants to

the

the Biſhops, Chancellours, Archdeacons, &c. being, as it were, their promotors, informers, and executioners, in all matters of juriſdiction and government, for to bring in money into their purſes: for performance alſo of which ſervice to them, the Church-wardens upon every occaſion are enforced to take ſuch corporall oathes as not one of them doth ever keep. What other ground of this, beſide the fore-mentioned, that particular Congregations are no ſpirituall incorporations, and therefore muſt have no officers for government within themſelves?

Now all theſe confuſions with many others of the ſame kinde, how they are condemned in the very foundation of them, M. Baines heere ſheweth in the firſt queſtion, by maintaining the divine conſtitution of a particular Church, in one Congregation. In which queſtion he maintaineth againſt his adverſaries a courſe not unlike to that which Armachanus, in the daies of King Edward the third, contended for againſt the begging Friers in his booke called *The Defence of Curates*: For when thoſe Friers incroached upon the priviledges of Parochiall Miniſters, he withſtood them upon theſe grounds: *Eccleſia Parochialis juxta verba Moſis Deut. 12. eſt locus electus a Deo, in quo debemus accipere cuncta quæ præcipit Dominus ex Sacramentis. Parochus eſt ordinarius Parochiani: eſt perſona a Deo præcepta, vel mandato Dei ad illud miniſterium explendum electa:* Which if they be granted, our adverſaries cauſe may goe a begging with the fore ſaid Friers.

Another ſort of corruptions there are, which though they depend upon the ſame ground with the former, yet immediately flow out of the Hierarchie. What is more diſſonant from the revealed will of Chriſt in the Goſpell, even alſo from the ſtate of the Primitive Church, then that the Church and Kingdome of Chriſt ſhould be managed as the Kingdomes of the world; by a Lordly authoritie, with externall pompe, commanding power, contentious courts of judgement, furniſhed with chancellours, officials, commiſſaries, advocates, proctors, paritors, and ſuch like humane deviſes? Yet all this doth neceſſarily follow upon the admitting of ſuch Biſhops as ours are in England: who not onely are Lords over the flock

but doe profeſſe ſo much in the higheſt degree, when they tell us plainely, that their Lawes or Canons doe binde mens conſciences. For herein wee are like to the people of Iſrael, who would not have God for their immediate King, but would have ſuch Kings as other Nations: Even ſo the Papiſts, and we after them, refuſe to have Chriſt an immediate King in the immediate government of the Church; but muſt have Lordly Rulers with ſtate in Eccleſiaſticall affaires, ſuch as the world hath in civill.

What a miſerable pickle are the moſt of our Miniſters in, when they are urged to give an account of their calling? To a Papiſt in deed they can give a ſhifting anſvver, that they have ordination from Biſhops, which Biſhops were ordained by other Biſhops, and they, or their ordeyners by Popiſh Biſhops: this in part may ſtop the mouth of a Papiſt: but let a Proteſtant which doubteth of theſe matters move the queſtion: and what then will they ſay? If they flie to popiſh Biſhops, as they are popiſh, then let them goe no longer masked under the name of Proteſtants. If they alledge ſucceſſion by them from the Apoſtles, then (to ſay nothing of the appropriating of this ſucceſsion unto the Popes chaire, in whoſe name, and by vvhoſe authority our Engliſh Biſhops did all things in times paſt) then I ſay they muſt take a great time for the ſatiſfying of a poore man concerning this queſtion, and for the juſtifying of their ſtation. For untill that out of good records they can ſhew a perpetuall ſucceſsion from the Apoſtles unto their Dioceſan which ordained them, and untill they can make the poore man which doubteth, perceiue the truth and certaintie of thoſe records (which I wiſſe they will doe at leaſure) they can never make that ſucceſsion appeare. If they flie to the Kings authoritie, the King himſelfe will forſake them, and denie that hee taketh upon him to make or call Miniſters. If to the preſent Biſhops and Arch-biſhops, alas they are as farre to ſeeke as themſelues, and much further. The proper cauſe of all this miſery is the lifting up of a lordly Prelacie, upon the ruines of the Churches liberties.

How intollerable a bondage is it, that a Miniſter being called to a charge, may not preach to his people except he hath

a licence from the Biſhop or Arch-biſhop: Cannot receiue the beſt of his Congregation to communion if he be cenſured in the ſpirituall Courts, though it be but for not paying of ſixe pence which they required of him in any name, be the man otherwiſe never ſo innocent: nor keep one from the communion, that is not preſented in thoſe Courts, or being preſented is for money abſolved, though he be never ſo ſcandalous: and muſt often times (if he will hold his place) againſt his conſcience put back thoſe from communion with Chriſt, whom Chriſt doth call unto it (as good Chriſtians if they will not kneele) and receive thoſe that Chriſt putteth backe, at the command of a mortall man.

What a burthen are poore Miniſters preſſed with, in that many hundreds of them depend upon one Biſhop and his Officers: they muſt hurrie up to the ſpirituall Court upon every occaſion, there to ſtand with cap in hand, not onely before a Biſhop, but before his Chancellour, to be railed on many times at his pleaſure: to be cenſured, ſuſpended, deprived, for not obſerving ſome of thoſe Canons, which were of purpoſe framed for ſnares, when far more ancient and honeſt canons are every day broken by theſe Iudges themſelues for lucre ſake, as in the making of Vtopian Miniſters, who haue no people to miniſter unto; in their holding of commendams, in their taking of money, even to extortion, for orders and inſtitutions: in their ſymonie, as well by giving as by taking: and in all their idle, covetous, and ambitious pompe? For all theſe and ſuch like abuſes, we are beholding to the Lordlineſſe of our Hierarchie: which in the root of it, is heere overthrowen by M. Bayne in the concluſions of the ſecond and third Queſtion. About which he hath the very ſame controverſie, that Marſilius Patavinus in part undertooke long ſince, about the time of Edward the ſecond, againſt the Pope. For he in his booke called *Defenſor pacis*, layeth the ſame grounds that here are maintained. Some of his words, though they be large, I will here ſet down for the Readers information.

Poteſtas clavium ſive ſolvendi & ligandi, eſt eſſentialis & inſeparabilis Presbytero inquantum Presbyter eſt. In hac authoritate, Epiſ-

copus a ſacerdote non differt, teſte Hieronymo, imo verius Apoſtolo, cuius etiam eſt aperta ſententia. Inquit enim Hieronymus ſuper Mat. 16. Habent quidem eandem judiciariam poteſtatem alii Apoſtoli, habet omnes Eccleſia in Presbyteris & Epiſcopis: præponens in hoc Presbyteros, quoniam authoritas hæc debetur Presbytero, in quantum Presbyter, primo, & ſecundum quod ipſum. Hæc nomina Presbyter & Epiſcopus in primitiva Eccleſia fuerunt ſynomina, quamvis a diverſis proprietatibus eidem impoſita fuerint, Presbyter ab ætate nomen impoſitum eſt, quaſi ſenior: Epiſcopus vero a dignitate, ceu cura ſuper alios, quaſi ſuperintendens. Many things are there diſcourſed to the ſame purpoſe, dict. 2. c. 15. It were too long to recite all. Yet one thing is worthy to be obſerved how he interpreteth a phraſe of Ierome ſo much alledged, and built upon by the Patrones of our Hierarchie. Ierome ſayth ad Evagr. that a Biſhop doth nothing, excepting ordination, which a Presbyter may not doe. Of this teſtimonie D. Downam avoucheth, that nothing can be more pregnant then it, to prove that Biſhops were ſuperiour to Presbyters in power of ordination. But heare what this ancient Writer ſaith, *Ordinatio non ſignificat ibi poteſtatem conferendi, ceu collationem ſacrorum ordinum: ſed œconomicam poteſtatem regulandi vel dirigendi Eccleſiæ ritus, atque perſonas, quantum ad exercitium divini cultus in templo; unde ab antiquis legumlatoribus vocantur Oeconomi reverendi.*

It would be overlong to declare all the uſe which may bee made of this Treatiſe, which being it ſelfe ſo ſhort, forbiddeth prolixitie in the Preface. If the Authour had lived to haue accompliſhed his purpoſe in perfecting of this worke, he would (it may be) have added ſuch conſiderations as theſe: or at leaſt he would haue left all ſo cleare, that any attentive Reader might eaſily have concluded them from his premiſſes. For ſupply of that defect, theſe practicall obſervations are noted: which with the diſpute it ſelfe, I leave to be pondered by the conſcionable Reader.

THE FIRST QVESTION IS, WHETHER CHRIST DID INSTITVTE OR THE APOSTLES frame any Dioceſan forme of Churches, or Pariſhionall onely.

FOR determining this Queſtion, we will firſt ſet down the Arguments which affirme it. Secondly, thoſe which deny. Thirdly, lay down ſome reſponſiue concluſions, and anſwer the objections made againſt that part we take to be the truth.

Thoſe who affirme the frame of Dioceſan Churches, vouch their Arguments: partly from Scripture: partly from preſidents, or inſtances ſacred and Eccleſiaſticall. Finally, from the congruitie it hath with reaſon, that ſo they ſhould be continued.

The firſt objection is taken from comparing thoſe two Scriptures. Titus 1. 5. Act. 14. 23. *Ordaine Elders Citie by Citie. They ordained Elders Church by Church.* Hence it is thus argued. They who ordained that a Citie, with the Suburbs and region about it, ſhould make but one Church, they ordeined a Dioceſan Church. But the Apoſtles, who uſe theſe phraſes as æquipollent, *To ordaine Preſbyters in every Citie*, and *to ordaine them in every Church*, appointed, that a Citie, with the ſuburbes and region about it, ſhould make but one Church. Ergo, the Apoſtles conſtituted a Dioceſan Church.

The reaſon of the propoſition is, becauſe Chriſtians converted in a Citie, with the ſuburbes, villages, and countries about it, could not be ſo few, as to make but a Pariſhionall Church. The Aſſumption is cleere, for theſe phraſes are uſed, as *ad æquate*, and being ſo uſed, needs it muſt be that the Apoſtles framed Cities, ſubburbs, and regions into one Church.

2 They argue from examples: Sacred and Eccleſiaſticall. Sacred, are taken out of the old and new Teſtament. Eccleſiaſticall, from the Primitiue times, and from Paternes in our owne times: yea, euen from ſuch Churches, as we hold reformed, as thoſe in Belgia and Geneva.

To beginne with the Church of the Iewes in the old Teſtament, whence they reaſon thus. That which many particular Synagognes were then (becauſe they were all but one Common-wealth, and had all but one profeſſion) that may many Chriſtian Churches now be upon the like grounds. But they then, though many Synagogues, yet becauſe they were all but one Kingdom, and had all but one profeſſion, were all one nationall Church. Ergo, upon like grounds many Churches with us, in a Nation or Citie, may be one Nationall or Dioceſan Church.

Secondly, the Church of Ieruſalem in the New-teſtament is objected. 1 That which the Apoſtles intended ſhould be a head Church to all Chriſtians in Iudea, that was a Dioceſan Church. But this they did by the Church of Ieruſalem. Ergo: 2. That which was more numberſome, then could meet Pariſhionally, was no pariſhionall but Dioceſan Church. But that Church was ſuch. Firſt, by growing to 3000, then 5000, Act. 2.41. & 4.4. then to haue millions in it, Act. 21.20. Ergo, the Church of Ieruſalem was not a Pariſhionall, but a Dioceſan Church.

Thirdly, the Church of Corinth is objected to haue bene a Metropolitan Church. He who writing to the Church of Corinth, doth write to all the Saints in Achaia with it, doth imply, that they were all ſubordinate to that Church. But this doth Paul, 1. Cor. 2. 1. Ergo. Secondly, He who ſaluteth jointly the Corinthians and Achaians, and calleth the Church of Corinth by the name of Achaia, and names it with preheminence before the reſt of Achaia, doth imply that the Church of Corinth was the Metropolitan Church to which all Achaia was ſubject. But the Apoſtle doth this, 2 Cor. 9. 2. & 11. 11. 8. 9. 10. Ergo.

Fourthly, that which was the mother Citie of all Macedonia, the Church in that Citie muſt be, if not a Metropolitan, yet a Dioceſan Church. But Philipi was ſo. Ergo.

The fifth is from the Churches of Aſia, which are thus proved, at leaſt to haue bene Dioceſan. 1 Thoſe ſeven Churches which conteyned all other Churches in Aſia ſtrictly taken, whether in Citie or Countrey, thoſe ſeven were for their circuit, Metropolitan, or Dioceſan Churches. But thoſe ſeven did conteine all other in Aſia. Ergo. 2 He who writing to all Churches in Aſia, writeth by name, but to theſe ſeven, he doth imply, that all the reſt were conteyned in theſe. But Chriſt writing to the ſeven, writeth to all

Churches

Churches in Aſia, not to name that two of theſe were Metropolitan Cities, viz Philadelphia, & Pergamus, ſeates Dioceſan at leaſt.

3 He who maketh the ſingular Church he writeth to, to be a multitude of Churches, not one onely (as the bodie is not one member onely) he doth make that one Church, to which he writeth in ſingular, to be a Dioceſan Church. But Chriſt in his Epiphonematicall concluſion to every Church, which he had ſpoken to in ſingular, doth ſpeak of the ſame as of a multitude. *Let him that hath eares, heare, what the Spirit ſaith to the Churches.* Ergo

Thus leaving Sacred examples, we come to Eccleſiaſticall.

Firſt, in regard of theſe ancient Churches, Rome, Alexandria. It is impoſſible they ſhould be a Pariſhionall Congregation 200 years after Chriſt. For if the multitude of Chriſtians did in Hieruſalem ſo increaſe within a little time, that they exceeded the proportion of one Congregation, how much more likely is it that Chriſtians in Rome and Alexandria did ſo increaſe in 200 years, that they could not keep in one particular Aſſembly. But the firſt is true. Ergo, alſo the latter. Which is yet further confirmed by that which Tertullian and Cornelius teſtifie of their times.

To come from theſe to our moderne reformed Churches, theſe proue a Dioceſan Church. That reſpect which many congregations diſtinct may haue now aſſembled in one place, that they may have ſevered in many places. For the unitie of the place is but extrinſicke to the unitie of the congregation. But many diſtinct congregations gathered in one Citie Church, may make, we ſay, one Church as they doe in the Netherlands. Ergo, diſtinct congregations, ſevered in diverſe places may make one Church. If many Churches, which may ſubject themſelves to the government of one Presbyterie, may ſo make one, they may ſubject themſelues to a Biſhop and Cathedrall Conſiſtorie, and ſo make one. But the 24 Churches of *Geneva*, and the territories belonging to it, doe ſubject themſelues to the government of one Preſbyterie, and ſo make one. For ſo farre as two meete in a third, they are one in it. Ergo.

The third principall Argument is from reaſon. If Citie Churches onely, and not the Churches of Villages, and Countrie Townes, had Biſhops, Preſbyters, and Deacons placed in them, then were thoſe Citie Churches Dioceſan Churches. But Citie Churches onely had theſe. Ergo, Citie Churches were Dioceſan, diſtinguiſhed from Pariſhionall Churches. The Aſſumption is proved firſt by Scripture, Titus 1. 5. Act. 14. 23. Secondly, this is proved by Eccleſiaſticall Storie. They who are given to labour the converſion of the Regions, rather then tend thoſe already converted, they were not given to a Pariſhionall Church. But the

Preſbyters

Preſbyters planted by the Apoſtles were ſo. Ergo. They who were ſet in a Church before Pariſhes were, could not be given to a Pariſhionall Church. But ſuch were the Preſbyters of the Apoſtles inſtitution, Ergo. For it is plaine in the practiſe of all ages, from the firſt diviſion, that no Church but the mother Church had a Preſbyterie and a Biſhop, but Preſbyters onely. Nay, it was ever by Councels condemned, and by the judgement of the ancient forbidden, that in Townes or Villages, any but a Preſbyter ſhould be planted. 3 This is alſo proved by reaſon, for it was no more poſſible to haue Biſhops & Preſbyters in everie Pariſh, then to haue a Maior and Aldermen (ſuch as we haue in London) in every Town. 2 If everie Pariſh had a Preſbyter, then had they power of ordination, and furniſhing themſelues with a Miniſter, when now they were deſtitute. But they were alwaies in this caſe dependant on the Citie. Ergo, there was then a Dioceſan Church having governement of others. Preſbyters could not ordeyne: *ſede vacante*, though they did at firſt, as in the Church of Alexandria. Let any ſhew for 400 yeares a Pariſhionall Church with a Preſbyterie in it.

Now we muſt muſter thoſe forces which oppoſe theſe Dioceſan Churches, allowing onely ſuch Churches to be inſtituted of Chriſt, which may meet in one Congregation ordinarily.

The word which without ſome modification ſuper-added, doth ſignifie onely ſuch a company as called forth, may aſſembly Politically, that word being alone, doth ſignifie ſuch a Church as may to holy purpoſes ordinarily meete in one. But the word *Church*, which Chriſt and his Apoſtles did inſtitute, is uſed indefinitely, and ſignifieth no more. Ergo. *Vbi lex non diſtinguit, non eſt diſtinguendum.* 2 The Scripture ſpeaketh of the Churches in a Kingdome or Province, alwaies in the plurall number, without any note of difference, as equall one with the other. Ergo, it doth not know Provinciall, Nationall, or Dioceſan Churches. Let a reaſon be given, why it ſhould never ſpeak in the ſingular number, had they bene a ſingular Church.

Secondly, let us come to examples: the Churches the Apoſtles planted were ſuch as might and did congregate.

Firſt, that of Hieruſalem, though there were in it toward 500 *Synagogues*, yet the Chriſtian Church was but one, and ſuch as did congregate into one place ordinarily after the acceſſe of 5000 to it. Act. 2.46. & 5.12. & 6.1. & 15.25. & 21.22. & 25.22. For their ordinarie meeting, as it is, Act. 2.46. *daily*, could not be a Panegericall meeting. Againe, if they might meet Synodically, why might they not meete then in daily courſe; though the univerſall meetiug of a Church is not ſo fitly called Synodicall: And though they

they are ſaid to be millions of beleevers, yet that was by accident of a circumſtance, happily the Paſſeover. We muſt not judge the greatneſſe of a water by that it is, when now it is up and ſwelleth by accident of ſome inundations. They had not a ſetled ſtate there, by which they did get the right of being ſet members. Yea, it is likely, they were and continued but one congregation. For 40 yeares after they were not ſo great a multitude, but that *Pella*, like to the *Zobar* of Lot, a little Towne could receiue them. But more of this in the anſwer to the objection.

Secondly, ſo the Church of Antiochia, was but one church. Act. 14. 27. they are ſaid to haue gathered the Church together. Ob. That is the Miniſters, or repreſentatiue Church. Anſ. 1 For Miniſters onely the Church is never uſed. 2 By analogie, Act. 11. Peter gave account before the whole Church, even the Church of the faithfull. Ergo. 3. They made relation to that Church, which had ſent thē forth with prayer & impoſition of hands, & this Church ſtood of all thoſe who aſſembled to the publicke ſervice and worſhip of God. 4. The people of the Church of Antioch were gathered together to conſider of decrees ſent them by the Apoſtles from Hieruſalem. τὸ πλῆθος.

Thirdly, the church of Corinth was one congregation, which did for the ſervice of God, or exerciſe of Diſcipline meet together. 1. Cor. 5. 4. 1. Cor. 14. 25. ver. 26. 1. Cor. 11. 17. ver. 23. *in uno & eodem loco.* That whole church which was guiltie of a ſinner uncaſt forth, could not bee a Dioceſan church, neither can the word συνερχεσθαι *comming together*, ever be ſhewed to ſignifie any thing elſe, beſides one particular Aſſembly.

Fourthly, the church of Epheſus was but one flocke. Firſt, it is likely that it was of no other forme then the other. Secondly, it was but one flock; that flock which Preſbyters might jointly feed, was but one. They had no Dioceſan Paſtour. If Preſbyters onely, then none but Pariſhionall Churches in and about Epheſus. There may be many flocks, but God ordained none, but ſuch as may wholy meete with thoſe, who haue the care of feeding and governing of them. Peter indeed, 1. Pet. 5. 2. calleth all thoſe he writeth to, one flocke: but that is in regard either of the myſticall eſtate of the faithfull, or in reſpect of the common nature which is in all churches one and the ſame: but properly, and in externall adunation, one flock is but one congregation. Thirdly, Pariſhes according to the adverſe opinion, were not then divided. Neither doth the long and fruitfull labours of the Apoſtles argue, that there ſhould be Pariſh churches in Dioceſan wiſe added; but a greater number of ſiſter churches. But when it is ſaid that all Aſia did heare: the

meaning is, that from hand to hand it did runne through Aſia, ſo as Churches were planted every where, even where Paul came not, as at Coloſſe. There might be many churches in Aſia, and many converted by Peter and others fruitfull labour without ſubordination of churches.

Examples Eccleſiaſticall. 1 Ignatius exhorteth the church of the Epheſians, though numberſome, to meete together often in one place, Epiſt. to the Epheſians, and to the Philippians: where the Biſhop is, let the people be gathered to him, as where Chriſt is, there is the whole hoſt of heaven. He calleth his church of Antioch a Synagogue of God, which cannot agree to a Dioceſan church: For theſe were particular congregations, oppoſed as to that Nationall church, ſo to all Provinciall and Dioceſan. Neither doth he call himſelfe Biſhop of Syria, but as he was, Biſhop of the congregation in Syria, as a Miniſter ſtileth himſelfe a Miniſter of the church of England.

2 Iuſtine and Ireneus knew no kinde of church in the world which did not aſſemble on the Sabboth. But a Dioceſan church cannot.

3 Tertullian Apol. cap. 39. doth ſhew that all churches in his time did meet, and did worſhip God, in which prayers, readings, exhortations, and all manner of cenſures were performed. Hee knew no churches which had not power of cenſures within themſelues.

4 Churches are ſaid at firſt to haue been Pariſhes, & Pariſhes with in cities, in Euſeb. lib. 3. 44. lib. 4. cap. 21. lib. 2. c. 6. l. 4. c. 25. and S. Iohn l. 3. c. 23. ſaith to the Biſhop, *redde Juvenem quem tibi ego & Chriſtus teſte Eccleſia tua tradidimus.* That church in whoſe preſence Iohn might commit his *depoſitum*, or truſt, was but one congregation, lib. 4. c. 11. Hyginus and Pius are ſaid to haue undertaken the Miniſterie of the church of Rome: which church was ſuch therefore, as they might miniſter unto. l. 7. 7 Dioniſius Alex. writeth to *Xiſtus*, and the church which he governed. A Dioceſan church cannot receiue letters. Before *Iulian* and *Demetrius* his time, there is no mention of churches in a Biſhops pariſh. The church of Alexandria was within the citie, l. 7. c. 2. Cornelius is ſaid, *officium Epiſcopi impleviſſe in civitate Romæ ex Cyp. l. 1. epiſt. 3.* Cornelius *Fœliciſſimum ex Eccleſia pepulit qui eum tamen de provincia pellere non potuit. Vide Ruffinum lib. 1. c. 6. ſuburbicarariarum Eccleſiarum tantum curam geſſit.* Cyprian was Paſtor *Paræciæ in Carthagine*, of the Pariſh in Carthage, Euſeb. lib. 7. cap. 3. *ex verbis Cipriani*, llb. 1. ep. 4.

5 It is the rule of Scripture, that a Biſhop ſhould be choſen in ſight of his people. Biſhops were choſen long after by the people.

As

As of *Rome*, and others by the people committed to them. lib. 4. epist. 1. Neighbour Bishops should come to the people over whom a Bishop was to be set, and chose the Bishop in presence of the people. Schismes were said to be from thence, *Quod Episcopo universa fraternitas non obtemperat, Cipr. ep. 55. tota fraternitas i. unius congregationis tota multitudo, ex qua componitur Ecclesia particularis. Sabino de universæ fraternitatis suffragio Episcopatus fuit delatus.* Cipr. l. 1. ep, 47. 58. 68. *Ecclesiæ igitur circuitus non fuit maior, quàm ut Episcopus totam plebem suam in negotiis huiusmodi convocare potuerit.* Soc. lib. 7. c. 3. de Agapeto. *Convocavit omnem clerum & populum qui erat intra illius jurisdictionem.*

6 The Chorepiscopi were Bishops in Villages; there is no likelyhood of the other notation. Their adversaries in opposing them never object that they were as Delegates, or Suffragan Bishops to them.

7 Bishops were wont to goe forth to confirme all the baptized through the Dioceſſe.

8 They were neighbours, and might meet a dozen, sixe, three, in the cause of a Bishop.

9 They were united, sometimes in Provincial Councels, in which many Bishops met twice yearely, Ruffin. l. 1. c. 6. Victor Vticensis reporteth in a time when they were fewest in Africa in persecution Vandalica, 660 fled to saue themselues. Austin saith there were innumerable orthodoxe Bishops in Africa: and the Provninciall Councels doe confirme the same.

Now by reason it is cleare that churches were not Metropolitan or Dioceſan.

1 That church whose causes are wanting, that church is wanting. But in a Dioceſan church causes are not to be found. Ergo.

First, the efficient cause, God ordeyning. For none can take on him to be a minister *Dioceſan*: no place to be a place, where the Assembly Dioceſan should be held; no people can worship God in repairing to this place and ministery, without warrant of his word. Ergo. The Nationall church of the Iewes, Aaron and his sonnes tooke not that honour, it was given them: The place of the Nationall meeting, God chose Hierusalem. The people he precisely bound to practise some ordinances of worship no where but there, and to appeare there before him. Secondly, the matter of a Dioceſan church is people within such a circuit, obliged to meet at least on solemne daies, whereſoeuer the Dioceſan Ministers and Ordinances of worship are exercised; Pastors who haue callings to tend them and minister to them in this Dioceſan meeting now assembled. Finally, the actuall meetings of them to such end, as such more sollemne and publike meetings are ordained to, are no where com-

manded, nor in any faſhon were ever by any warrant of the Word practiſed.

If any ſay, theſe are not the cauſes of a Dioceſan church, but an ordinance of God binding perſons within ſuch a circuit to ſubject themſelues to ſuch a church and the miniſterie thereof, that they may be governed by them.

I anſwer. Firſt, there is no ordinance of God for this, that can be ſhewed, that churches within ſuch a circuit ſhould be tyed to a certaine head church for goverment. Nay it is falſe. For every church by Chriſts inſtitution hath power of goverment; and the Synagogue had in ordinarie matters, the government that the Church of Ieruſalem had; (being all over) except onely in ſome reſerved cauſes. Secondly, I ſay, that this will not make a Dioceſan church formally ſo called. As a Nationall church could not formally bee without binding the whole Nation to exerciſe ordinances of worſhip in the head church of it: So by proportion. Yea government is a thing which doth now *accidere* to a church conſtituted, and doth not eſſentially concurre as matter or forme to conſtitute a church of this or that kinde. Againe, were this true, that the Dioceſan Paſtors and Miniſters haue onely governement committed to them, then it will follow, that they onely have the governing of particular churches, who are not any way Paſtors of them, miniſtring Word and Sacraments to them. But this is moſt abſurd, that their proper and ordinary Paſtors, who diſpence Word and Sacraments to them, ſhould not haue *poteſtatem pedi*, nothing to doe in governing thoſe flockes which depend on them. If any ſay, they were not *actu*, but they were *virtute potentiæ*: I ſay, it is alſo to make the Apoſtles churches imperfect: and how can this be known but by a preſumed intention, which hath nothing to ſhew it, but that after event of things.

From the effect I argue.

2 Thoſe churches which Chriſt did ordeine and the Apoſtles plant, might ordinarily aſſemble to the ordinances of worſhip. But a Dioceſan church cannot ordinarily aſſemble. Ergo. For when God will haue mercy and not ſacrifice, and the Sabboth is for man, hee will not for ever ordaine a thing ſo unequall and impoſſible, as is the ordinarie aſſembling of a Dioceſan multitude. If any diſtinguiſh the aſſumption, and conſider a Dioceſan as ſhe is in her parts, or as ſhe is *a totum*, ſtanding of her parts now collected together, and ſay ſhe may, and doth meete and communicate, and edifie her ſelfe in the firſt reſpect. I anſwer, this is nothing, and doth proue her to be nothing, as ſhe is a Dioceſan Church; *quia quid quid eſt, agit ſecundum quod eſt*. If therefore a Dioceſan Church were a reall Church, ſhe muſt haue the effect of ſuch a Church; to wit,

aſſembling

aſſembling, as ſhe is Dioceſan. The Synagogues through Iſrael met Sabboth by Sabboth, but were no Nationall Church in this regard; that is to ſay, as it is a Nationall Church, it had her Nationall reall meetings.

I reaſon thirdly from the ſubject.

3 That Church which doth *per ſe*, eſſentially require locall bounds of place, that muſt have locall limits ſet forth of God. But a Dioceſan Church doth ſo. Ergo. Whence I thus inferre, He who inſtitutes a Dioceſan Church, muſt needs ſet out the locall bounds of this Church. But God hath not ſet out any local bounds of the Church in the New Teſtament: Ergo, he hath not inſtituted any Dioceſan Church. The propoſition is certain: for this doth enter in the definition of a Dioceſan Church, as alſo of a Nationall. And therefore God inſtituting the Nationall Church of the Iewes, did as in a map ſet forth the limits of that nation. So alſo if he had inſtituted Dioceſan and Provinciall Churches, he would have appointed locall bounds, if not particularlie deſcribed, yet known and certain. But God hath not done this. For the Church of the New Teſtament is not thus tied to places; it being ſo with the power of teaching, and the Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction, that it doth *reſpicere ſubditos* onelie *per ſe*, not *terminos locales*. Civill juriſdiction doth *reſpicere ſolum* primarilie, the ſubiects on it in the ſecond place. As for that commandement of *appoynting Preſbyters Citie by Citie*, it is too weake a ſparr for this building. Again, that Church which may be ſaid to be in a Citie, is not Dioceſan. But the Churches which the Apoſtles planted, are ſayd to be in Cities. Ergo. If one ſay tó the propoſition, they may; becauſe the head Church is in the Citie. *Anſwer.* The Churches the Apoſtles planted are taken for the multitude of Saints vnited into ſuch a body Eccleſiaſticall. But the multitude of Saints through a Dioceſſe cannot be ſaid to be in a Citie. Ergo. The ſoule may be ſaid to be in the head, though it be in other parts; and God in heaven. God, becauſe of his moſt infinite and indiviſible nature; And ſo the ſoule, becauſe it is indiviſible, and is as all of it in every part, not as a thing placed in a place containing it, but as a forme in that which is informed by it. But in things which have quantitie, and are part out of another, there is not the like reaſon.

4 From the adjuncts. That Church which hath no time ſet, wherin to aſſemble, is no Church. I ſuppoſe the ground above, that nothing but union of a Dioceſe in worſhip, can make a Dioceſan church. But this Church hath no time. Ordinarie it cannot have; extraordinarie ſolemnities God hath not commanded. Ergo, there is no ſuch Church. For if it be a reall Dioceſan Church, it muſt haue a reall action according to that nature of which it is. The action formall of a Church indefinite is to meet and communicate in worſhip. Of

a Nationall Church, is to meet nationally and communicate in worſhip. If then it muſt meet, it muſt have ſome time ſet down, ordinarie or extraordinarie. But God hath done neither. The Churches, which the Apoſtles planted, were in their times moſt perfect and flouriſhing. But Dioceſan Churches were not: for in thoſe times they were but in *ſeminali* infolded, not explicated, as the adverſaries confeſſe.

4 That which maketh Gods diſpenſation incongruous to his miniſters, is abſurd. But a Dioceſan frame of Church doth ſo. Ergo. That which maketh God give his extraordinary gifts to miniſters of churches in the Apoſtles times, when now they had but one congregation, and give ordinary gifts onely when now they had 800 churches under them, is abſurd. But this doth the Dioceſan frame. Ergo.

5 The churches through out which a Preſbyter might do the office of a teaching Preſbyter, and a Deacon the office of a Deacon, were not Dioceſan. But every Preſbyter might miniſter in the word and ſacraments throughout the Church to which he was called; ſo might a Deacon tend to the poore of the whole church, whereof he was a Deacon. Ergo, theſe were not Dioceſan. The reaſon of the propoſition is. No Preſbyter can through many congregations performe ordinarie miniſterie. In which regard the Canon law forbiddeth that Preſbyters ſhould have many Churches, *C.10.q.3. Vna plures Eccleſiæ vni nequaquam committantur Preſbytero; quia ſolus per Eccleſias nec officium valet perſolvere, nec rebus earum neceſſariam curam impendere.*

6 If God had planted Dioceſan churches, that is, ordeined that all within citie, ſuburbs, and regions, ſhould make but one Dioceſan Church, then may not two Dioceſſes be vnited into one Church, or another Church and Biſhop be ſet within the circuit of a Dioceſan church. But neither of theſe are ſo. The judgement of the African fathers ſhew the one, and the Canon law doth ſhew the other. *p.2. c.16.41.* Ergo.

7 If God appointed the frame of the church Dioceſan ſtanding of one chiefe church, others vnited in ſubjection: then can there not be the perfection of a church in one congregation. But where there may be a ſufficient multitude deſerving a proper Paſtor or Biſhop, requiring a number of Pteſbyters and Deacons to miniſter unto them, there may be the perfection of a church. But in ſome one congregation may bee ſuch a multitude. Ergo.

8 Thoſe churches which may lawfullie have Biſhops, are ſuch churches as God inſtituted. But churches in Towns, populous Villages, have had, & may have their Biſhops. Ergo. This is proved by κατὰ πόλιν every populous Towne, ſuch as our market townes,

and

and others; yea by a *ſynecdoche*, villages; for there they taught as wel as in Cities. There were Synagogues as well as in Cities. They excepted againſt them afterward in vnconformitie to Law. The teſtimonie of *Zozomen* ſheweth what kinde of congreations were they of which *Epiphanius* teſtifieth. And the fathers of Africa did not require, that a Dioceſan multitude, but a ſufficient multitude, not through every part, for then they ſhould have had to doe in Citie churches, but in that part of the Dioceſſe where a Presbyter onely had ſerved the turne, ſhould have their Biſhop.

If Dioceſan churches, and provinciall churches be Gods frame, then we had no Churches in Brittaine of Gods frame, before that *Auſtin* was ſent by *Gregorie* the great. But here were churches from before *Tertullian*, after the frame God requireth, at leaſt in their judgements. Ergo.

Now to come to open the termes, and lay downe concluſions: whether Dioceſan or Pariſhionall Churches were conſtiſtuted.

Firſt, the word *Church* we underſtand here, not *figuratively*; taken *Metonymically* for the place, Synecd. for Miniſters adminiſtring ordinances: but *properly*, for a body politick, ſtanding of people to bee taught and governed, and of teachers and governours.

Secondly, it may be asked, what is meant by a Dioceſan church? *Anſ.* Such a frame in which many Churches are vnited with one head church, as partaking in holy things, or at leaſt in that power of government which is in the chiefe church, for all the other within ſuch or ſuch a circuit. Theſe phraſes of a *Dioceſſe*, a *Dioceſan Biſhop*, or *Church*, are all ſince the time of *Conſtantine*, yea the two laſt much later. A Dioceſſe ſeemeth from the common-wealth to have been taken up in the Church, from what time Biſhops had Territories, ample demaines, and ſome degree of civill iuriſdiction annexed to them. For a Dioceſſe by the Lawyers, is a circuit of provinces, ſuch as the Romans Præſidents had: or *active*, an adminiſtration of thoſe Prouinces with juriſdiction. *L. unica. c. ut omnes judices.* And in the Canon law, ſometimes *Provincia* and *Diocœſis* are uſed promiſcuouſly. *diſt.* 50. *c.* 7. But the ancienteſt uſe of this word was to note the Territory, or Countrey circuit, oppoſed to the Citie. Thus the Countrey churches are called *Dioceſanæ Eccleſiæ, cont.tur. c.* 8.

Thus *Baptiſmales Eccleſiæ* were contra-diſtinguiſhed to Pariſhionall. Theſe had every one a Dioceſſe, and the inhabitants were called *Dioceſani*: theſe churches had a moyite of houſes dwelling in neighbourhood that belonged to them; but at length by a Synecdoche, the whole Church was called a Dioceſſe; though the Canoniſts diſpute whether it may be ſo called, ſeeing the Dioceſſe is

the

the meaner part by much, in compariſon of the Citie, and ſhould not give the denomination to the whole. So at length the Biſhop was called *Diocæſanus*, and the Church which had been called *Eccleſia civitatis, matrix, nutrix, Cathedralis*, grew to be called *Dioceſan*. But here we take a Dioceſan Church for ſuch a head Church, with which all Churches in ſuch a circuit hath reall union, and communion in ſome ſacred things. Now a Dioceſan Church may be put *objectivè*, that is, for a Church in which are miniſters and miniſterie for the good of the whole Dioceſſe, though they ſhould never aſſemble, as the worſhip in the Church of Ieruſalem was for al Iudea, & profited though abſent. Or it may be put formally for a body politicke, a congregation of beleevers through a Dioceſſe, with the miniſters of the ſame, having ſome reall union and communion in ſacred things. We deny any ſuch Church.

A Pariſhionall Church may be conſidered *Materially* or *Formally*, Materially, as it is a Church within ſuch locall bounds, the members whereof dwell contiguouſly one bordering upon the other. This God inſtituted not, for it is accidentall to the Church, may *abeſſe* and *adeſſe* a Church remaining one. If a Pariſhionall Church in London ſhould dwell, as the Dutch doe, one farre enough from the other, while the ſame beleevers were united with the ſame governours, the Church were not changed, though the place were altered. Secondly, it is put formally, for a multitude which doe in manner of a Pariſh ordinarily congregate; ſuch Churches, and ſuch onely we ſay God erected.

Now for ſome concluſions, what wee agree in, then what ſevers us.

Concluſ. 1. Churches of Cities, Provinces, Kingdomes, may bee called Dioceſan, Provinciall, National Churches, as the Churches of the world are called Oecumenicall, yea haply not without warrant of Scripture; As 1. *Pet.* 1. 1. writing to all thoſe diſperſed Churches, ſpeaketh of them ſingularly as of one flock, 1. *Pet.* 5. 2. The reaſon is, things may be called not onely as they are really in themſelves, but according to ſome reſpect of reaſon, under which we may apprehend them.

Concl. 2. That there may be a reall Dioceſan, Nationall, or head Church, wherewith others ſhould be bound to cõmunicate more ſolemnly in word & ſacraments, and in ſome more reſerved caſes concerning their government. This was done in the Church of Iudea. Our men are to ſhie, that feare to come to this propoſition, *de poſſe*. I am ſure our adverſaries will grant us, that our pariſhionall frame might have been ſo conſtituted.

Concluſ. 3. That there cannot be ſuch a frame of Church, but by Gods inſtitution. No Miniſters can take this honour, but they muſt

(as

(as *Aaron*) be called to it. When nothing in nature can have further degree of perfection, then the authour of nature putteth into it; how much more must the degree of perfection and eminence in things Ecclesiasticall, depend on God? Wee may reason from the Church of Iudea, as *a pari*, to prove, That there cannot bee such a Church, but that all subordinates must communicate with the chiefest head Church in some sacred things, which may make them one Church. Thus there would not have been a Church Nationall of the Iewes, but that all the Nation had union and communion together even in the worship and ordinances of worship. The men onely went up, so the male onely were circumcised: but the female representativelie went up in them.

Obiect. It is enough if the communion be in government, which all our opposites grant necessarie.

Answ. This maketh them rather one *in tertio quodam separibili*, then one Church: government being a thing that commeth to a Church now constituted, and may be absent, the Church remaining a Church. The first Churches of Bishops, when now they were divided, did keep all other, who were the Bishops presbyters strictly so called, and the people also in some communion with the head Church; for in greater solemnities one and other went up thither. See *decret. dist.* 3. *dist.* 38.

4 *Conclus.* We agree in this, that Churches were in their first planting, either not actually Diocesan, being one congregation without any other subordinate, or if they had any, yet were they imperfect, wanting many parts or members of particular Churches, which belonged to them.

That wherein we contradict one another, is, we affirme that no such head Church was ordained either virtually or actually, but that all Churches were singular congregations, equall, independent each of other in regard of subjection. Secondly, we say, were there a Diocesan granted, yet will it not follow, that Parish churches should be without their government within themselves, but onely subject in some more common & transcendent cases. As it was with the Synagogues and that Nationall Church of the Iewes, & as it is betwixt Provinciall and Diocesan Churches. If any say there is not the same reason of a Diocesan Church & Parishionall: for that hath in it all the perfection of a Church. I answer, not; taken in comparison to a Provinciall Church, it is but a part and member, and hath not perfection, no more then a parochiall Church hath, compared with a Diocesan.

Now followeth to answer the Argnments first proposed.

To the first, I answer to the proposition by distinction. Those who ordained that the *Civitas* and *Vrbs* people taken in regard of the

whole multitude of the one, and locall bounds of the other; ſhould make but one Church, they did inſtitute a Dioceſan church. But thoſe who ſo inſtituted a Church in Citie, ſuburbs, Countrey that their number might bee compared fitly to one congregation, they did not therefore ordaine a Dioceſan Church. Againe to the aſſumption. But thoſe who uſe *Citie by Citie*, and *Church by Church* as equivalent (which the Apoſtles doe) they ordained that Citie, ſuburbs, and Countrey ſhould make but one Church. I anſwer by the like diſtinction. They who uſe, *Citie by Citie*, people being taken for the whole multitude within the extent of theſe locall bounds, as equivalent with *Church by Church*, they may bee ſayd to have ordained that citie, ſuburbs, and teritories, ſhould make but one Church. But thus the Apoſtles doe not uſe them, as of equall ſignification. For the Citie had a reaſon of an ample continent, the Church of a thing contained. Theſe phraſes are, the one proper, the other metonymicall, and are therefore to bee expounded the one by the other. Hee placed Preſbyters κατὰ πόλιν, leſt wee ſhould underſtand it of the multitude and locall bounds, it is ſayd in the Acts of the Apoſtles that they placed them κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, Church by Church: becauſe Preſbyters were not given but to Diſciples and Chriſtians now converted out of the multitude and locall limits wherewith cities were bounded. Secondly, there is an *adequate* acception of theſe phraſes *per accidens*, not becauſe the citie and church was to make but one church, but becauſe the Chriſtians by occaſion of their number, not being then too great, were framed into one church; or becauſe by occaſion there was yet but one church, not becauſe there was to be but one. Now he who thus uſeth them promiſcuouſly, doth imply that one church was as yet conſtituted, not that there was to bee but one through the circuit of citie, ſuburbs and countrey. Thus likewiſe it is eaſily anſwered to the proofe of the propoſition: For thus the multitude of citizens converted and unconverted, could not bee a church of one congregation, yet the number of thoſe who in citie, ſuburbs, and territories, were actually converted, was no more then might be ordered into one church, and the Apoſtles framing theſe into one on the preſent occaſion, did not exclude the after conſtituting of any other within the ſame locall bounds.

To the ſecond Argument: and Firſt, to the objection from the Nationall church of the Iewes. I anſwer, denying the aſſumption. That the Synagogues being many, made one Church; becauſe they were all one kingdome, one poſſeſſion. For thus there was one Occumenicall Church, when the world was under one Emperour

Emperour, and of one profeſſion. It is accidentall to the unitie of a Church whether the kingdom be one or no. If Iſraell, when God had divided the kingdome into two, had gone up to Hieruſalem, and kept there communion in the worſhipp of that Church, they had ſtill beene one Church, though two Kingdomes. If here were as many Kings and Kingdomes as have been in England, ſo many as ſhould belong to one Provinciall Church, ſhould bee one Church, though many Kingdomes. The truth is, they were one Church, becauſe they had union and Nationall communion in the ordinances of worſhip, which were in that one Church to which they all belonged. The high Prieſt was their proper Prieſt, hee made interceſſion for them, bleſſed them, they were not to offer any where, but there. If any think this cannot bee the cauſe, why they were one Church, under the government of one high Prieſt, for then ſhould *Aaron* have been as well as *Melchiſedeck*, a type of Chriſts kingly office. I anſwer, there is *Prieſtly* Prelacie and government, as well as *Princely*; They were under *Aaron* in the former regard, in which hee was a ſhadow of Chriſt.

To the ſecond inſtance of Hieruſalem; wee deny the propoſition. It might bee intended for a head and mother Church in regard of order, and yet not bee a Nationall Church having power over others: If it ſhould have been a head, having power accordingly, as it was a mother Church, it ſhould have been head to all the world. Secondly, Wee deny the Aſſumption. That the Apoſtles ever intended, that it ſhould be a head to Chriſtian Churches through Iudea: as it had been before under the High Prieſt. That conſtitution was typicall, and may better plead for an univerſall Chriſtian Church, then for a Nationall. Secondly, there is not the leaſt intimation of Scripture this way. Thirdly, had this Divinitie been knowne, the Fathers would not have ſuffered, that it ſhould have been made a Dioceſan church, and ſubjected to Cæſarea. To the Proſillogiſme. The Church which was ſo numberſome, that it could not meet ordinarily, could not bee a pariſhionall Church. This was ſo. Ergo, &c. To the propoſition I anſwer. That which was by inhabitants, who had *fixum domicilium*, ſo numberſome that it could not meet, I grant it. But ſo this was not; by accident often many others were there *in tranſitu*. Secondly, nay wee read that they did meet ordinarily, as is aboue ſaid, and in that deliberation about which the Church of Antioch did ſend to them, as *Irenæus* affirmeth. *l.* 3. *c.* 12. *Vniverſam eam conveniſſe.*

Luke affirmeth the ſame. As for that of millions of beleevers, it is certaine, they were not fixed members of this Church. For would *Luke*, who reckoneth the growth of them to 5000. have concealed ſo notable acceſſions, whereby they ſay, they grew up to I know not how many thouſands; there is no likelihood. Whether therefore they were ſuch beleevers as are mentioned, *Iohn* 2. or whether by occaſion of the Paſſover, or Pentecoſt, or ſuch like feaſt, they were *in tranſitu*, onely there for the preſent. However it is, there is no likelihood that they were conſtant members of that Church. Neverteleſſe, ſay, they were more then could fitly meet, yet might they bee tollerated, as in one Congregation. The Apoſtles ſeeing ſuch times to enſue, wherein many of them ſhould tranſlate themſelves, and bee diſperſed hither and thither. God letting it grow a while more ranke and abundant then ordinary Churches are to bee, becauſe it was *Eccleſia ſurcularis*, many of whoſe branches were to bee tranſplanted in their time. Yea had there been five thouſand ſetled members, we read of ſome ordinarie Auditories, ſpoken to by ordinarie Paſtors, as great; as *Chryſoſtome* on *Math.* 24. doth ſignifie, to his eſteeme they might be five thouſand that then heard his voyce.

Touching the third inſtance, As to the firſt reaſon, The propoſition is denyed: for naming the reſt of Achaia with them, doth no more ſignifie the ſubiection of all Achaians, then in the 1. *Corinth.* 1. 2. naming all Saints in every place, doth ſignifie their ſubiection. The ſecond reaſon, hath the ſequell of the propoſition denied: for the contrary is rather true. He who without any note of difference calleth the Church of Corinth by the name of Achaia, hee doth imply that it is but one particular Church, equall with the other Churches in Achaia. To the third, the propoſition is againe denied, That hee that ſpeaketh of all the Churches as one, doth imply a metropolitan Church. For by the firſt concluſion we may ſpeake of things not onely as they are really, but according to any reſpect of reaſon, under which they are apprehended. Again, the aſſumption is falſe: He ſpeaketh not of them as one Chnrch, but as divers Churches in one Province. But it is named and ſet before others. Ergo. &c. The ſequell is againe denied. For it may be named before other, becauſe it is the moſt illuſtrious and conſpicuous Church; but not becauſe it hath any power over other. Finally, it is too groſſe to thinke, that all in Achaia came to Corinth to be inſtructed and make their contributions, every Church uſing the firſt day of the week when they aſſembled to make their collections within themſelves.

The fourth inſtance is *Crete*; where the many Churches in that Iland ſo full of Cities are ſaid to be one Church of Crete, whereof Titus was Biſhop. Thoſe manifold Churches which made but one, whereof Titus was Biſhop, thoſe were all one Nationall Church. But the Churches of Crete, as ſaith the ſubſcription, were ſo. Ergo. Anſ. The propoſition might be queſtioned on the ground aboue: but the aſſumption is falſe; proved by a ſubſcription, which is like his proofe, which was brought out of the book after the Revelation. For firſt, they are not in the Syriack teſtament. Secondly, they are not thought of Antiquity ancienter then Theodoret. Thirdly, the ſubſcription is falſe, and moſt unlikely. For had Paul written from Nicopolis, he would haue wiſhed Titus to come to him to Nicopolis, where he was for the preſent and meant to winter, rather then haue ſpoken of it as a place from which he was abſent, and whether he meant to repaire.

The fift inſtance. Phillip. 3. That church, which was in the chiefe citie of all Macedonia, muſt needs be at leaſt a Dioceſan. But the Church of Philippi was ſo. Ergo. This will proue an argument, when Churches muſt needs be conformed to the civill regencie of the Emperour: his foure chiefe Governours called *præfecti prætorii*, his preſidents of Provinces under them, and inferiour Iudges, and Magiſtrates, under theſe in one citie, and the regions of it. But this is an errour giving ground to a Patriarchall and Oecumenicall Church, as well as a Provinciall and Dioceſan. This rule of planting Churches varieth at mans pleaſure: For the Romane Provinces after the people of Rome gaue up their right to the Emperour, were brought all into one, under one head and Monarch, and Provinces haue bene diverſly divided from time to time. From this Monarchie aroſe the Popes plea againſt the Greeke Churches for his Oecumenicall ſoveraigntie. What forme of Churches muſt wee haue amongſt them who never received any ſuch gouernement, nay any government at all. If I were a Conformitant I ſhould object otherwiſe for a Provinciall Church in Philippi: viz. thus. That Church which had many Biſhops in it could not bee Pariſhionall nor Dioceſan, but Provinciall. For the Provinciall Church hath the Metropolitan and Suffragan Biſhops in it, and no other. But Philippi had ſo. Ergo. But the Propoſition is true onely when it is underſtood of Dioceſan Biſhops, not of Pariſhionall Biſhops. Againe, Paul writeth not to the Biſhops in the Church, but in the Citie: Now many Biſhops are not in the Provinciall Citie, though many are in a Provinciall Church.

Now to come to the churches of Aſia. I anſwer to the propoſition of the firſt Syllog. by diſtinction. One church may conteine others, as an example doth conteyne in it a thing exemplified: or

as a head Church doth Churches united in ſubjection to it. Thoſe Churches which conteine all other in the latter ſence, it is true, they were at leaſt Dioceſan: but in this ſenſe the aſſumption is denyed. The ſame anſwer fitteth the Proſyllog. Hee that writing to theſe, writeth to all other by vertue of their ſubjectionall ſubordination, he doth imply that all others are conteyned in theſe as member Churches under one head. But he who writing to theſe, writeth to all other as exemplified onely in them, he doth not imply any ſuch thing. Now this is manifeſt, becauſe hee writeth to ſeven Churches: whereas this were ſuperfluous, if Chriſt did intend his letter onely to head Churches conteyning other. For then fiue Churches ſhould haue bene written to onely, ſeeing in them all others were conteyned, as they ſay. For by law of this virtual continencie, Philadelphia and Thiatira were included in two of the other, viz. Sardis, & Pergamus, which were their mother cities. What needed he haue named Thyatira, which by law of this virtuall continencie did intend to direct his letter onely to head Churches? Againe, the aſſumption is falſe: For he doth write principally to the ſeven, and to all other Churches in Aſia no further then hee writeth to all the Churches in the world. There were other Churches in Aſia, ſuch as were Coloſſe, Hierapolis, Troas, the Church at Miletum, and Aſſos, which the Centuries mention, which depended not on thoſe ſeven. If Coloſſe and Hierapolis were not, as Laodicæa, reedified when Iohn did write the Revelation, yet theſe other Churches were then extant. Not to name Magneſia and Tralles, the independancie whereof is fully cleared whatſoever Doct. Downam objecteth.

To the third reaſon; from Chriſts manner of concluding his Epiſtles, it is anſwered by denying the aſſumption. For Chriſt doth not uſe the plurall number in reſpect of that one Church preceding, but in reſpect of the ſeven collectiuely taken, it being his will that the members of each ſingular Church ſhould lay to heart both ſeverally and jointly, what ever was ſpoken to them and to others.

Now to come to the Eccleſiaſticall examples, as of Rome, and Alexandria, two hundred yeares after Chriſt. And firſt to anſwer the reaſon brought for their increaſe, ſuch as could not keepe ſtill in a Pariſhionall meeting. The Propoſition is not of neceſſarie conſequence; for there were very extraordinarie reaſons of that which which was effected in the Church of Ieruſalem: From Chriſt himſelfe, from the reſidence of all the Apoſtles; from the ſtate of the people there aſſembled; from the ſtate of that Church; from the time in which theſe were done. Chriſt had

had prayed for them particularly, to which ſome attribute the firſt miraculous converſion by Peters preaching. Againe, it was fit, that being now aſcended into his glory, hee ſhould there more aboundantly diſplay his power, and more conſpicuouſly ſwallow up the ſcandall of his croſſe. Againe, this Church had the labour of all the Apoſtles for a time in it: whoſe care and induſtrie we may gueſſe by their ordination of Deacons, that they might not bee diſtracted. Thirdly, the confluence and concourſe to Hieruſalem was of much people, who though explicitely they did not beleeue in Chriſt, yet had in them the faith of the Meſſiah, and therefore were neerer to the kingdome of God then the common Heathen. The ſtate of this Church was ſuch, that it was to ſend out light to all other, a common nurſerie to the world. Finally, the time being now, the beginning of planting that heavenly Kingdome, ſeeing beginnings of things are difficult, no wonder if the Lord did reveale his arme more extraordinarily. It doth not therefore follow from this particular, to the ſo great encreaſing of theſe churches in tract of time. Nay, if theſe other Churches had enjoyed like increaſe in their beginnings, it would not follow, as thus. *Thoſe Churches which within a few yeares had thus many in them, how numberſome were they many yeares after.* Becauſe the growing of things hath a Period ſet, after which, even thoſe things which a great while encreaſed, doe decreaſe and goe downeward, as it was in Ieruſalem. Not to mention, that we deny the aſſumption.

But though the Argument is but Topicall, and can but breed an opinion onely, yet the teſtimonies ſeeme irrefragable. Tertullian teſtifying that halfe the Citizens in Rome was Chriſtians. And Cornelius, that there was beſides himſelfe, and 45 Preſbyters, a numberſome Clergie.

I anſwer, That Tertullians ſpeech ſeemeth to be ſomewhat Hyperbolicall: for who can beleeue that more then halfe the Citie, and world, after a ſort, were Chriſtians. But he ſpeaketh this, and truely in ſome regard, becauſe they were ſo potent through the world, that if they would haue made head they might haue troubled happily their perſecutors. Or elſe hee might ſay they were halfe of them Chriſtians, not becauſe there were ſo many members of the Church: but becauſe there were ſo many who did beare ſome favour to their cauſe, and were it as ſafe as otherwiſe, would not ſtick to turne to them. But Tertullian knew no Churches which did not meet, having prayers, exhortations, and miniſtering all kindes of Cenſures: If therefore there were more Churches in Rome in his time, it will make little for Dioceſan Churches.

Touching

Touching Cornelius: we anſwer. It is not unlike but auditories were divided and tended by Preſbyteries. Cornelius keeping the Cathedrall Church, and being ſole Biſhop of them: but we deny that theſe made a Dioceſan Church. For firſt, the Cathedrall aud Parochiall Churches were all within the Citie, in which regard hee is ſaid, *Officium Epiſcopi implediſſe in civitate Romæ.* Neither was his Church as ample as the Province, which that of Fœliciſſimus ſufficiently teacheth. Secondly, we ſay that theſe Parochiall churches, were to the mother church, as chappels of eaſe are to theſe churches *in metrocomiis*, they had communion with the mother church, going to the ſame for Sacraments and hearing the Word, and the Biſhop did goe out to them and preach amongſt them. For ſome of them were not ſuch as had liberty of Baptizing, and therefore could not be ſevered from communion with the head Church.

Now to anſwer further, it is beyond 200 yeares for which our defence is taken. For there is reaſon why people which had bene held together for 200 years as a Congregation, might now 50 years after be exceedingly encreaſed. The Eccleſiaſticall ſtorie noteth a moſt remarkeable increaſe of the faith, now in the time of Iulian before Cornelius. Neither muſt we thinke that an Emperour, as Philippus, favouring the faith, did not bring on multitudes to the like profeſſion. Secondly, we ſay, there is nothing in this of Cornelius which may not well ſtand, that the Church of Rome, though now much increaſed, did not keep together as one Church. For the whole people are ſaid to haue prayed and communicated with the repentant Biſhop, who had ordeyned Novatus: and we ſee how Cornelius doth amplifie Nouatus his pertinacie: From hence, that none of the numerous Clergie, nor yet of the people, very great and innumerable, could turne him, or recall him, which argueth that the Church was not ſo aboundant, but that all the members of it had union and communion, for the mutuall edifying and reſtoring one of another. And I would faine know, whether the ſeven Deacons, ſeven Subdeacons, 42 Acolouthes, whether thoſe exorciſtes, Lectors, Porters about 52 are ſo many, as might not be taken up in a Congregation of fifteene or twentie thouſand? Surely the time might well require them, when many were to bee ſent forth to doe ſome part of miniſterie more privately. Not to name the errour of the Church in ſuperfluous multiplications of their Preſbyters, to vilifying of them, as they were ſuperfluous in the point of their Deacons. There were 60 in the church of Sophia for the help of the Liturgie. True it is, the Congregation could not but be exceeding great, and might well be called in a manner innumerable, though it were but of a twentie thouſand people. But becauſe of that which is reported touching diviſion by Euariſtus, Hyginus, Dionyſius, and Marcellinus,

Marcellinus, though there is no authenticke authour for it; neither is it likely in Hospinianus judgement. Let it be yeelded that there were some Parochiall divisions, they were not many, and within the Citie, and were but as Chappels of ease to the cathedrall or mother Church.

Concerning the objection from the Churches of Belgia, or the low Countries, we deny the proposition: for we cannot reason thus. *If many Masters, and distinct formes of Schollers, in one free Schoole, be but one Schoole: then many Masters and company of Schollers, severed in many Schooles, are but one Schoole.* Secondly, they haue communion in the communitie of their Teachers, though not in the same individuall word tended by them. But it is one thing, when sheep feed together in one common Pasture, though they bite not on the same individuall grasse: Another thing when now they are tended in diverse sheepe gates. Not to urge, that in the Sacraments and Discipline, they may communicate as one Congregation.

Touching the objection from Geneua: I answer to the proposition by distinction. *Those who subject themselues to a Presbyterie, as not having power of governing themselues within themselues, as being under it by subordination, these may in effect, as well be subject to a Consistorie: But thus the twenty foure Churches of Geneua doe not.* They or haue power of governing themselues, but for greater edification, voluntarily confederate, not to use nor exercise their power, but with mutuall communication, one asking the counsell and consent of the other in that common Presbyterie. Secondly, it is one thing for Churches to subject themselues to a Bishop and Consistorie wherein they shall haue no power of suffrage: Another thing to communicate with such a Presbyterie, wherein themselues are members and Iudges with others. Thirdly, say, they had no power, nor vvere no members in that Presbyterie, yet it is one thing to submit thēselues to the government of Aristocracie, another to the Bishops Monarchicall government. For vvhile his Presbyters are but as counsellours to a King, though he consulteth vvith them, he alone governeth. Geneva made this consociation, not as if the Prime Churches were imperfect, and to make one Church by this union: but because though they were intire Churches, and had the power of Churches, yet they needed this support in exercising of it, and that by this meanes the Ministers and Seniors of it might haue communion. But what are all the 24 churches of Geneva to one of our Diocesan Churches.

Now to answer the reasons. The first of them hath no part true: the proposition is denyed. For these churches which had such Presbyters and Deacons as the Apostles instituted were

Pariſhionall, that is, ſo conjoyned that they might and did meete in one Congregation. The Doctor did conſider the ſlenderneſſe of ſome of our Pariſhes, and the numberſome Clergie of ſome Cathedrall Churches, but did not conſider there may be Preſbyteries much leſſer, and congregations ampler and fuller, and yet none ſo bigge as ſhould require that multitude he imagineth, nor made ſo little as might not haue Preſbyters and Deacons. What though ſuch Maior and Aldermen as are in London cannot bee had in every Town, yet ſuch a Towne as Cambridge may haue ſuch a Maior and Aldermen as Cambridge affoords, and the meaneſt market Town may haue, though not in degree, yet in kinde like Governnours. So is it in Preſbyters and other Officers: the multitude of Preſbyters falling forth *per accidens*, not that a Biſhop is ever to haue a like numberſome Preſbyterie, but becauſe the Church is ſo numberſome that actions liturgicall require more copious aſſiſtance, & ſo wealthy, that it can well maintaine them. And beſide, becauſe of that Collegiate reaſon which was in them rather then Eccleſiaſticall, which the fathers had in their Preſbyteries; for the nurſing of plants, which might be tranſplanted for ſupply of vacant Churches, which was a point that the Apoſtles in planting Churches no whit intended.

To come to the aſſumption: *But citie Churches onely had a Biſhop with Preſbyters and Deacons.* Anſwer, Firſt, not to ſtand upon this, that S. *Paul* ſet no Biſhops with Preſbyters, but Preſbyters onely, and they ſay Biſhops were given, when the Preſbyters had brought the Church to be more numberſome, the aſſumption is falſe, that *Citie Churches onely had them.* For the Scripture ſaith, they planted them Church by Church, that is, through every Church. Then every Church had her Governours with in her ſelfe. we muſt uſe as ample interpretations as may be. Contrarily, the ſenſe which arrogateth this to one from the reſt we cannot without evidence receiue it, *in ambitioſis reſtricta interpretatio adhibenda eſt.* *Eccleſia* doth not ſignifie any Church without difference, Pariſhionall, Dioceſan, or Provinciall; but onely a company orderly aſſembling, not ἀγορασία but ἐκκλησία νομιμὴ καὶ ὡρισμένη. Such a company therefore as congregate decently to ſacred purpoſes is a Church by tranſlation. Beſides the indefinite is equivalent to the univerſall, as, κατὰ πόλιν is καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν, ſo κατ' ἐκκλησίαν is καθ' ἑκάστην ἐκκλησίαν. Now their interpretation beggeth every thing without any ground. For when Preſbyters may be taken but three wayes: *diviſim*, *conjunctim*, and *diviſim and conjunctim*: *diviſim* one Preſbyter in one, another in another, *conjunctim*, diverſe Preſbyters in every Church; neither of theſe will ſerue their turne, the

latter

latter onely being true: for Scripture making two kinds of Presbyters without which the Church cannot bee governed, it is sure it did giue of both kinds to every Church they planted. Now they seeing some Churches in our times to haue many, and some one, conster it both waies *Collective*, many Presbyters, and *Singularly*, one here and one there, and because many Presbyters cannot be thus placed in our frame of Churches, imagine the Church to containe Parochiall and Diocesan Churches?

But they will not seeme to speake without reason; the Scripture say they placed Citie by Citie Presbyters, and therefore in such Churches as occupied Citie, Suburbes and Countrey, which Parishionall ones doe not. But may not a Church of one Congregation be in a citie, without occupying limits of citie, suburbes and countrey: and if Presbyters be placed in such a Church, may they not be said to be placed in Cities. Indeed if the Presbyters placed in Cities were given to all the people within such bounds, the case were other; but the citie is not literally thus to be understood, but metonymically for the Church in the Citie. Neither was the church in the citie, all within such bounds; for the Saints of a place and Church of a place, are all one in the Apostles phrase of speech. As for that which is objected from Ecclesiasticall historie, it is true, that in processe of time, the Bishop onely had a company of Presbyters. Before, Churches kept in one Congregation and had all their Presbyters. Churches should so haue afterward bene divided, that all should haue been alike for kind, though in circumstantial excellencie some were before other. What a grosse thing is it to imagine, that the first frame the Apostles did erect was not for posteritie to imitate? A fitter example then to take out of the custome of *Metropoles*, who sending out there ἀποικίας or *Colonies*, doe use to reserue some cases in civill jurisdiction over them, which the state of later Churches did expresse.

THE SECOND QVESTION

WHETHER CHRIST ORDAINED by himselfe, or by his Apostles, any ordinary Pastors, as our Bishops, having both precedencie of order, and maioritie of power above others.

WEE will follow the same method: First, setting down the arguments for it, with answers to them: Secondly, the arguments against it: Thirdly, lay downe conclusions. The arguments for it are: First, taken from Scripture: secondly from practise of the Churches: thirdly from reason evincing the necessitie of it.

The first Argument.

Those whom the Holy Ghost instituted, they are of Christs ordaining. But the Holy Ghost is sayd to have placed Bishops, Act. 20. Ergo, Bishops are of Christs ordeining.

Answer. We deny the assumption: viz. That those Presbytere of Ephesus were Dioceſan Bishops. It is most plaine they were such who did *Communi consilio* tend the feeding and government of the Church; such Bishops whereof there might be more then one in one congregation. The common gloſſe referreth to this place that of *Ierom*: that at first Presbyters did by common councell governe the Chnrches. Yea D. *Downam* doth count Ephesus as yet to haue had no Bishop, who was sent unto them after *Pauls* being at Rome, as he thinketh. And others defending the Hierarchie, who thinke him to have spoken to Bishops, doe judge that these words belong not to Presbyters, but are spoken in regard of others together then present with them, to wit, of *Timothy*, *Sosipater*, *Tychicus*, who, say they, were three Bishops indeed; but that he speaketh of these who indeed were in company, is quite besides the text.

The ſecond Argument.

Such Paſtors as the ſeven Angels, Chriſt ordained. But ſuch were Dioceſan Biſhops. Ergo. The aſſumption proved. Thoſe who were of ſingular preheminencie amongſt other Paſtors, and had corrective power over all others in their Churches, they were Dioceſan Biſhops. But the Angels were ſingular perſons in every Church, having Eccleſiaſticall preheminencie and ſuperioritie of power. Ergo, they were Dioceſan Biſhops. The aſſumption is proved. Thoſe who were ſhadowed by ſeven ſingular Starres, were ſeven ſingular perſons. But the Angels were ſo. Ergo. Againe, Thoſe to whom onely Chriſt did write, who onely bare the praiſe, diſpraiſe, threatning, in regard of what was in the Church amiſſe, or otherwiſe: they had Majoritie of power above others. But theſe Angels are written to onely, they are onely praiſed, diſpraiſed, threatned. Ergo. &c.

Anſw. 1. In the two firſt ſyllogiſmes the aſſumption is denyed. Secondly, in the firſt Proſyllogiſme the conſequence of the propoſition is denied, That they muſt needs be ſeven ſingular perſons. For ſeven ſingular ſtarres may ſignifie ſeven Vnites, whether ſingular or aggregative: ſeven pluralities of perſons who are ſo united as if they were one. And it is frequent in Scripture to note by a unity, a united multitude. Thirdly, the conſequence of the propoſition of the laſt proſyllogiſme is denyed. For though we ſhould ſuppoſe ſingular perſons written to, yet a preheminencie in order and greater authoritie, without majoritie of power, is reaſon enough why they ſhould be written to ſingularly, and blamed, or praiſed above other. Thus the maſter of a Colledge, though he have no negative voyce, might be written to, & blamed for the miſdemeanors of his colledg, not that hee hath a power overruling all: but becauſe ſuch is his dignitie, that did he doe his endevour in dealing with, and perſwading others, there is no diſorder which he might not ſee redreſſed. Fourthly, againe the aſſumption may bee denyed: That they are onely written to. For though they are onely named, yet the whole Churches are written to in them; the ſupereminent member of the Church by a Synecdoche put for the whole Church. For it was the cuſtome in the Apoſtles times, and long after, that not any ſingular perſons, but the whole Churches were written unto, as in *Pauls* Epiſtles is manifeſt, and in many examples Eccleſiaſticall. And that this was done by Chriſt here, the Epiphonemaes teſtifie. *Le: every one heare what the ſpirit ſpeaketh to the Churches.*

The third Argument.

Thoſe whom the Apoſtles ordained, were of Apoſtolicall inſtituon. But they ordained Biſhops. Ergo. The aſſumption is proved by induction.

First, they ordained *Iames* Bishop of Ieruſalem preſently after Chriſts aſcention. Ergo they ordained Biſhops. This is teſtified by *Euſebius, lib. 2. Hiſto. cap. 1.* out of *Clement* and *Hegeſippus*: yea that the Church he ſate in was reſerved to his time, *lib. 7. cap. 19. & 32.* This our own authour *Ierom teſtifieth, Catalog. Script. Epiph. ad hær. 66. Chryſoſt. in Act. 3. & 33. Ambroſ. in Galath. 1. 9. Dorotheus in Synopſis. Aug. contra Creſ. lib. 2. cap. 37.* the generall Councell of Conſt. in Trull. *cap. 32.* For though hee could not receive power of order, yet they might give him power of juriſdiction, and aſſigne him his Church. So that though he were an Apoſtle, yet having a ſingular aſſignation, and ſtaying here till death, he might iuſtly be called the Biſhop, as indeed he was. If he were not the Paſtor, whom had they for their Paſtor.

Secondly, thoſe ordinary Paſtors who were called Apoſtles of Churches in compariſon of other Biſhops and Preſbyters; they were in order and maioritie of power before other. But *Epaphroditus* was the Apoſtle of the Philippians, though they had other called Biſhops. Chap. 1. 14. Ergo. The aſſumption; that he is ſo called, as their eminent Paſtor, is manifeſt by authorities. *Ierom. in Phil. 2. Theod.* and *Chryſoſt.* on the ſame place. Neither is it like this ſacred appropriate name ſhould bee given to any in regard of meere ſending hither or thither. Yea this, *that he was ſent*, did argue him there Biſhop: for when the Churches had to ſend any where they did uſually intreat their Biſhops.

Thirdly, *Archippus* they inſtituted at Coloſſe. Ergo.

Fourthly, *Timothy* and *Titus* were inſtituted Biſhops, the one of Epheſus, the other of Crete. Ergo. The Antecedent is proved thus. That which is preſuppoſed in their Epiſtles, is true. But it is preſuppoſed that they were Biſhops in theſe Churches. Ergo. The aſſumption proved. Thoſe whom the Epiſtles preſuppoſe to have had Epiſcopall authoritie given them to bee exerciſed in thoſe Churches, they are preſuppoſed to have been ordained Biſhops there. But the Epiſtles preſuppoſe them to have had Epiſcopall authoritie given them to bee exerciſed in thoſe Churches. Ergo. The aſſumption proved. 1. If the Epiſtles written to *Timothy* and *Titus*, be the paternes of the Epiſcopall function, informing them, and in them all Biſhops, then they were Biſhops. But they are ſo. Ergo. 2 Againe, whoſoever preſcribing to *Timothy* and *Titus* their duties as governours in theſe Churches, doth preſcribe the very dutie of Biſhops, he doth preſuppoſe them Biſhops. But *Paul* doth ſo: For what is the office of a Biſhop beſide teaching, but to ordaine and governe: and governe with ſingularitie of prehéminence, and maioritie of power in compariſon of other. Now theſe are the things which they have in charge, *Tit. 1. 5.*

1. *Tim.* 5. 22. 1. *Tim.* 1. 3. 11. 2. *Tim.* 2. 16. Ergo. 3 Thoſe things which were written to informe not onely *Timothy* and *Titus*, but in them all their ſucceſſours who were Dioceſan Biſhops, thoſe were written to Dioceſan Biſhops. But theſe were ſo. Ergo, to Dioceſan Biſhops. Now that Dioceſan Biſhops were their ſucceſſours, is proved. 1. Either they, or Presbyters, or Congregations. Not the latter. 2. Againe, Thoſe who did ſucceed them were their ſucceſſours. But Dioceſan Biſhops did. Ergo. The aſſumption is manifeſt by authorities. In Epheſus from *Timothy* to *Stephanus* in the Councell of Chalcedon. And in Crete, though no one is read to have ſucceeded, yet there were Biſhops Dioceſan. And we read of *Philip* Biſhop of Gortina the Metropolis. 4. Thoſe who were ordinarily reſident, and lived and died at theſe Churches, were were there Biſhops. But *Timothy* was bid abide here, *Titus* to ſtay to correct all things, and they lived and died here. For *Timothy* it is teſtified by *Hegiſippus*, and *Clement* and *Euſebius* out of them, whom who ſo refuſe to beleeve, deſerve themſelues no beliefe. Ergo, they were there Biſhops. Againe, Ierom. in Cat. Iſidorus de vita & morte Sanct. Antoninus par. 1. Tit. 6. cap. 28. Niceph. lib. 10. Cap. 11. theſe doe depoſe, that they lived and died there. Further, to prove them Biſhops. 5. Their function was Evangeliſticall and extraordinarie, or ordinarie; not the firſt; that was to end. For their function as aſſigned to theſe Churches, and conſiſting eſpecially in ordaining and iuriſdiction, was not to end. Ergo. Aſſumption proved. That function which was neceſſarie to the beeing of the Church, was not to end. But the function they had as being aſſigned to certaine Churches, is neceſſarie to the beeing of the Church, Ergo. &c. 6 Finally, that which Antiquitie teſtifieth, agreeing with Scripture, is true. But they teſtifie that they were Biſhops, which the ſubſcriptions of the Epiſtles alſo affirme. Ergo. Euſebius Lib. 5. Cap. 4. Dyoniſ. Areopag. Doroth. in Synopſi. Ambroſe præm. in 1. Tim. 1. Ierom. 1. Tim. 1. 14. 2. Tim. 4. in Catalo. Chryſoſtom. in Philip. 1. Epiph. in Hær. 5. Primaſ. præfat. in 1. Tim. 1. 1. Theod. præfat. in Tit. Oecum. Sedulius. 1. Timoth. 1. as it is ſayd in the book of hiſtories. Greg. Lib. 2. Cap. 12. Theoph. in Epheſ. 4. Niceph. lib. 2. Cap. 34.

Anſwer.

We deny the aſſumption of the firſt Syllogiſme, with all the inſtances brought to proue it.

Firſt, for *Iames*, we deny he was ordained Biſhop, or that it can be proued from antiquitie, that he was more then other Apoſtles. That which *Euſebius* reporteth, is grounded on *Clement*, whom we know to be a forged magnifier of Romiſh orders, and in this ſtory he doth

ſeeme to imply, that Chriſt ſhould haue ordeyned *Peter*, *Iohn* and *Iames* the greater, Biſhops. Seeing he maketh theſe to haue ordeyned *Iames* after they had got of Chriſt the ſupreme degree of dignitie, which theſe forged deceitfull Epiſtles of Anacletus do plainly affirme. Secondly, as the ground is ſuſpected; ſo the phraſe of the Fathers, *Calling him the Biſhop of that Church*, doth not imply that he was a Biſhop properly ſo called. The fathers uſe the words of *Apoſtoli* and *Epiſcopi* amply, not in their ſtrict & formall proprietie. *Ierom* on the firſt to the Galathians, and in his Epiſtle to *Damaſus*, affirmeth that the *Prophets* and *Iohn* the Biſhop might be called Apoſtles. So many fathers call *Phillip* an Apoſtle. *Clem.* 5. *Conſt. cap.* 7. *Euſeb. lib.* 3. *cap. ult. Tertul. de Bapt. cap.* 8. and others. In like manner they call the Apoſtles Biſhops; not in proprietie of ſpeech, but becauſe they did ſuch things as Biſhops doe, and in remaining here or there made reſemblance of them. Thus *Peter*, *Paul*, *Iohn*, *Barnabas*, and all the reſt, are by the Ancients called Biſhops. Obj. This is granted true, touching others, but not in this inſtance of *Iames*: becauſe it is ſo likely and agreeable to Scripture, as well as all other Story; that when all the reſt of the Apoſtles departed out of Ieruſalem, he did ſtill abide with them even to death. Anſwere, though this bee but very conjecturall, yet it nothing bettereth the cauſe here. It followeth not, Hee did abide with this Church. Ergo, he was the proper Biſhop of this Church. For not abiding in one Church doth make a Biſhop: but he muſt ſo abide in it, that he muſt from the power of his office, onely be bound to teach that Church: ſecondly, to teach it as an ordinary Paſtor of it: thirdly, to governe it with a power of juriſdiction, limited onely to that Church. But *Iames* was bound to the reſt of the Circumciſion by his office, as they ſhould from all the world reſort thither. Secondly, he did not teach but as an Embaſſadour extraordinarily ſent from Chriſt, and infallibly led by his Spirit into all truth. Ergo, not as an ordinary Biſhop. Thirdly, as the reſt in what Provinces ſoever they reſted, had not their juriſdiction diminiſhed, but had power occaſionally, as well where they were not, as where they were; ſo it was with *Iames*. This might happily make the phraſe to be more founded out of *Iames*, that he did in this circumſtance of reſiding, more neerly expreſſe an ordinary Paſtor then any other. It is plaine, Antiquitie did hold them all Biſhops, and gather them ſo to be, *a Priori & Poſteriori*: the Author *de queſt. vet. & nov. teſt. cap.* 97. *Nemo ignorat Epiſcopos ſalvatorem Eccleſijs inſtituiſſe priuſquam aſcenderet; imponens manus Apoſtolis, ordinavit eos in Epiſcopos.* Neither did they thinke them Biſhops becauſe they received a limited juriſdiction of any Church; but becauſe they were enabled to doe all thoſe things which none but Biſhops could regularly

regularly does *Oecumenius in Act.* It is to be noted, sayth he, that *Paul* and *Barnabas* had the dignitie of Bishops: for they did not make Bishops onely, but Presbyters also. Now wee must conster the ancient, as taking them onely eminentlie and virtuallie to have been bishops, or elſ we muſt judge them to have been of this mind, That the Apoſtles had both as extraordinary legats moſt ample power of teaching and governing ſuting thereto, as alſo the ordinary office of Biſhops and Paſtors with power of teaching and governing, ſuch as doe eſſencially and miniſterially agree to them: which indeed D. Downam himſelfe confuteth, as Popiſh, and not without reaſon, though while he doth ſtrive to have *Iames* both an Apoſtle and a Biſhop properly, himſelfe doth confirme it not a little.

Wherefore it will not be unprofitable to ſhew ſome reaſons why the Apoſtles neither were nor might bein both theſe callings.

Firſt, That which might make us doubt of all their teaching and writing, is to be hiſſed forth as a moſt dangerous aſſertion. But to make *Iames*, & ſo any of them, haue both theſe offices in proprietie, might make us doubt. Ergo. The aſſumptiō proved thus. That which doth ſet them in office of teaching liable to errour, when they teach from one office, as well as infallibly directed with a rule of infallible diſcerning, when they teach from the other, that doth make us ſubject to doubting in all they teach and write. But this opinion doth ſo. Ergo. The propoſition is, for ought I ſee, of neceſſarie truth, the aſſumption no leſſe true. For if there bee any rule to direct *Iames* infalliblie, as he was formally the ordinarie biſhop of Ieruſalem, let us heare it: if there were none, may not I queſtion, whether all his teaching and writing were not ſubject to errour. For if he taught them as an ordinary biſhop, and did write his Epiſtle ſo, then certainly it might erre. If he did not teach them ſo, then did he not that he was ordained to, neither was he properly an ordinarie Paſtor, but taught as an extraordinary Embaſſadour from Chriſt.

Secondly, Thoſe offices which cannot bee exerciſed by one, but the one muſt expell the other, were never by God conjoyned in one perſon. But theſe doe ſo: Ergo. The aſſumption is manifeſt, Becauſe it is plain, non can be called to teach as a legat extraordinarie, with infallible aſſiſtance, and unlimited juriſdiction, but he is made uncapable of being bound to one Church, teaching as an ordinarie perſon with juriſdiction limited to that one Church. Againe, one can no ſooner be called to doe this, but at leaſt the exerciſe of the other is ſuſpended. Thirdly, that which is to no end, is not to be thought to be ordained of God. But to give one an ordinarie authoritie whereby to doe this or that in a Church, who

had a higher and more excellent power of office, whereby to doe those same things in the same Church, is to no end. Ergo.

Obiect. But it will be denied that any other power of order, or to teach and administer sacraments was given, then that hee had as an Apostle: but onely jurisdiction or right to this Church as his Church.

Answer. To this I reply, first, that if hee had no new power of order, he could not be an ordinarie Bishop properlie and formally so called. Secondly, I say power of governing ordinarie was not needfull for him who had power as an Apostle in any Church where hee should come. *Obiect.* But it was not in vaine, that by assignation hee should have right to reside in this Church as his Church. *Answer.* If by the mutuall agreement in which they were guided by the spirit, it was thought meet, that *Iames* should abide in Ierusalem, there tending both the Church of the Iewes, and the whole circumcision, as they by occasion resorted thither, then by vertue of his Apostleship hee had no lesse right to tend those of the circumcision by residing here, then the other had right to doe the same in the Provinces through which they walked. But they did think it meet that he should there tend that Church, and with that Church all the Circumcision, as they occasionally resorted thereto. Ergo. For though hee was assigned to reside there, yet his Apostolicke Pastorall care was as *Iohns* and *Peters*, towards the whole multitude of the dispersed Iewes, Galath. 2. Now if it were assigned to him for his abode, as hee was an Apostolicke Pastor, what did hee need assignation under any other title. Nay he could not have it otherwise assigned, unlesse wee make him to sustaine another person, viz. of an ordinary Pastor, which he could not be who did receive no such power of order as ordinarie Pastors have.

Fourthly, That calling which hee could not exercise without beeing much abased, that hee never was ordained unto, as a poynt of honour for him. But hee could not exercise the calling of an ordinarie Bishop, but hee must bee abased. Hee must bee bound by office to meddle with authoritie and jurisdiction, but in one Church, hee must teach as an ordinarie man liable to errour. Ergo, hee was neuer ordained ro bee a Bishop properlie. If it bee sacriledgee to reduce a Bishop to the degree of a Presbyter, what is it to bring an Apostle to the degree of a Bishop? True it is, hee might have been assigned to reside constantly in that Church without travelling, and bee no whit abased: but then he must keepe there as Pastor of it with Apostolicall authoritie, caring not for that Church, but the whole number of the Iewes, which he might doe without travelling. Because

cauſe who ſo keeped in that Church, hee did not need to goe forth as the reſt; for the Iewes from all parts come to him. But he could not make his abide in it as an ordinarie teacher and governour, without becomming many degrees lower then hee was. For to live without going forth, in the mother Church of all the world, as an ordinary paſtor, was much leſſe honour then to travaile as *Peter* one while into Aſſyria, another while through Pontus Galatia, Bithynia, as an Apoſtle. Even as to ſit at home in worſhipfull privat place is leſſe honourable then to goe abroad as Lord Embaſſadour bither or thither. Honour and eaſe are ſeldome bedfellowes. Neither was *Iames* his honour in this circumſtance of the reſt, but in having ſuch an honorable place wherein to exerciſe his Apoſtolicke calling. As for that queſtion, who was their ordinarie Paſtor, it is eaſily anſwered; Their Preſbyters, ſuch as *Linus* or *Clemens* in Rome, ſuch as Epheſus and other Churches had. *Iames* was their Paſtor alſo, but with extraordinary authoritie. What needed they an ordinarie Biſhop, which grew needfull (as the favourers of the Hierarchie ſay) to ſupply the abſence of Apoſtles, when now they were to deceaſe? What needed then here an ordinary Biſhop, where the Apoſtles were joyntly to keepe twelve yeares together, and one to reſide during his life, according to the current of the ſtory. Thus much about the firſt inſtance.

To the ſecond inſtance of *Epaphroditus*, and the argument drawen from it. Firſt, we deny the propoſition. For had ſome ordinarie Paſtors been ſo ſtiled, it might imply but a preheminencie of dignitie in them above other: wherefore unleſſe this bee interſerted, it is unſound, viz. *Thoſe ordinarie Paſtors, who are called Apoſtles in compariſon of others, becauſe the Apoſtles did give to them power of ordination, juriſdiction, and peereleſſe preheminencie, which they did not give to others, they are above others.* Secondly, the aſſumption is falſe altogether: Firſt, that *Epaphroditus* was an ordinarie Paſtor: ſecondly, that hee was called an Apoſtle in compariſon of inferiour Paſtors of that Church. *Obj.* But the iudgment of *Ierom*, *Theodoret*, *Chryſoſtom*, is that he was. *Anſw.* the common judgement is, that he was an egregious teacher of theirs, but further then this, many of the teſtimonies doe not depoſe. Now ſo he might be: for he was an Evangeliſt, and one who had viſited and laboured among them, and therefore might be called their teacher, yea an egregious teacher, or Doctor of them. Nay, S. *Ambroſe* doth plainly inſinuate, that hee was an Evangeliſt: for he ſayth hee was made their Apoſtle by the Apoſtle, while he ſeut him to exhort them, and becauſe he was a good man, he was deſired of the people. Where he maketh him ſent, not for perpetuall reſidence amongſt them, but for the tranſient exhorting of them, and maketh him ſo deſired of the

Philippians, becauſe hee was a good man, not becauſe he was their ordinarie Paſtor. *Ieroms* teſtimonie on this place doth not evince. For the name of Apoſtles and Doctors is largely taken, and as appliable to one, who as an Evangeliſt did inſtruct them, as to any other. *Theod.* doth plainly take him to have been as their ordinarie biſhop, but no otherwiſe then *Timothy* and *Titus*, and other Evangeliſts are ſayd to have been biſhops: which how true it is, in the next argument ſhall bee diſcuſſed. For even *Theodoret* doth take him to have been ſuch an Apoſtolick perſon as *Timothy* and *Titus* were. Now theſe were as truely called biſhops as the Apoſtles themſelves. Neither is the rule of *Theodoret* to be admitted: for it is unlike that the name of Apoſtle ſhould be communicated then with ordinarie Paſtors, where now there was danger of confounding thoſe eminent miniſters of Chriſt with others, and when now the Apoſtles were deceaſed, that then it ſhould ceaſe to be aſcribed to them. Againe, how ſhall we know that a biſhop is to be placed in a citie, that hee muſt be a perſon thus and thus (according to *Pauls* Canons) qualified: all is voided and made not to belong to a biſhop. For thoſe who are called bishops, were Preſbyters and no biſhops, biſhops being then to be underſtood onely under the name of Apoſtles & Angels. Thirdly, antiquitie doth teſtifie, that this was an honour to biſhops, when this name was Eccleſiaſtically appropriated to them. But if they ever had been termed by the name of Apoſtles before, this had been a debaſing of them. Neither is there reaſon why they ſhould be called Apoſtles. In juriſdiction Apoſtolical the Apoſtles were not ſucceeded. Iuriſdiction Epiſcopal they never exerciſed, nor had, and therefore could not be ſucceeded in it. The Apoſtles gave to Preſbyters that which Chriſt gave them out of his power; even the power of ordinary government. They are bid ποιμαίνειν, and βόσκειν, to feed, as well by government as doctrine. They are bid not to play the Lords over the flock. What feare of tyrannie where there is no power of government? But lay authorities aſide, conſider the thing from the text it ſelfe. First, *Paul* ſeemeth but occaſionallie to ſend him, he having purpoſed to have ſent *Timothy*, who as yet could not bee employed. *I thought it neceſſarie to ſend Epaphroditus to you.* Secondly, hee doth implie, that *Epaphroditus* had not returned to them, but that he ſent him; and that therefore he was not the ordinary Biſhop of it. It is like, hee was but ſent till *Timothy* might be diſpatched to them. Neither is it any thing probable he ſhould be called an Apoſtle, as their ordinarie and eminent Paſtor. In the Scriptures, none are laid to be Apoſtles further then they are in habitude to ſome ſending them. Now this is undoubted, the Philippians had ſent him to *Paul*. It is then moſt probable when he is

called

called their Apoſtle, it is in regard he was ſent by them, which the Apoſtle pointeth at in the next words, *Who hath miniſtred to me the things needfull which you ſent by him.* Obiect. But it is unlikely that this word appropriated to the Twelue, ſhould be uſed of thoſe ſent civily. Not ſo, for while the perſons ſending are ſignified, they are ſufficiently contradiſtinguiſhed; it being the Priviledge of the Apoſtles, that they were the Apoſtles of Chriſt Ieſus, not ſimply that they were Apoſtles. Secondly, *Iohn* 13. It is made common to all that are ſent. For though Chriſt meane it of himſelfe, yet he implies it by a diſcourſe, *a genere ad ſpeciem.* Thirdly, we ſee the like phraſe, 2. Cor. 8. *the Apoſtles of the Churches.* For *Chryſoſtome* there underſtandeth thoſe whom the Churches had ſent for that preſent. That doth not hinder, they were ſent by *Paul* to the Churches, therefore the Churches might not ſend them with their contributions. Neither is this an argument that he was their Biſhop, becauſe their Church ſent him: for they ſent Apoſtles themſelues and Euangeliſts alſo more ordinarily, it being their office to goe from Church to Church, for the edification of them.

For the inſtance of *Archippus* I finde it not urged.

Now to come to the laſt inſtances of *Timotheus* and *Titus.*

Firſt, we deny the Antecedent, that they were inſtituted Biſhops by *Paul.* And in the firſt proſillogiſme we deny the Aſſumption: *that the Epiſtles doe preſuppoſe ſo much.* And to the proſillogiſm, tending to proue this aſſertion denyed, we anſwer: firſt, to the propoſition, by diſtinguiſhing the Epiſcopall authoritie, which is conſidered both in regard of that which is materiall, and in regard of the formall reaſon which doth agree to it. The Propſition is true, underſtanding it of authority in both theſe regards; thoſe who are preſuppoſed to haue had authority Epiſcopall given them, both for the ſubſtance of it, and the formall reaſon which doth agree to it in an ordinary Biſhop, they are preſuppoſed Biſhops: but this is denyed. For they are preſuppoſed to haue and exerciſe power Epiſcopall for the materiall of it, as Apoſtles had alſo; but not to haue and exerciſe in that manner and formallitie which doth agree to a Biſhop, but which doth agree to an Euangeliſt, and therefore they are bidden to doe the worke of an Euangeliſt, to exerciſe all that power they did exerciſe as Euangeliſts. There is nothing that *Paul* writeth to *Timothy* to doe in *Epheſus*, or to *Titus Crete*, which himſelfe preſent in perſon might not and would not haue done. If we ſhould reaſon then thus: He who did exerciſe Epiſcopall power in theſe churches, he is preſuppoſed to haue been Biſhop in them. This propoſition is not true, but with limitation: He who exerciſed Epiſcopall power after that formall manner, which doth agree to the office of a Biſhop, he was Biſhop; but not he who exerciſeth the

power *secundum aliam rationem & modum*; viz. after such a manner as doth agree to an Apostle.

To the second maine proofe, wee denie the proposition. If patternes for Bishops, then written to Bishops. The reason is, Apostles, Euangelists, ordinarie Pastors, haue many things common in their administration. Hence is it, that the example of the one may be a patterne to another, though they are not identically, and formally of one calling. Councels haue enjoyned all Presbyters to be well seene in these Epistles, as being patternes for them, *Vide Aug. De doctrin. Christ. cap. 16. lib. 4.*

To the third reason. *Who so prescribing them their duties doth propose the verie duties of Bishops, hee doeth take them to haue beene Bishops.* The Proposition is not true without a double limitation. If the Apostle should propose such duties of Bishops as they in later times usurped, he doth not therfore presuppose them Bishops, because these are duties of Euangelists, agreeing to Bishops onely by usurpation. Againe, should he propose those duties which, say they, the word doth ascribe and appropriate to Bishops, yet if he doe not prescribe them as well in regard of matter as forme exercised by them, it will not follow that he doth take them for Bishops: nor that *Paul* doth propose the verie duties of Bishops, both in substance and manner of performance. Secondly, wee deny him to propose for substance the duties of Bishops. For hee doth not bid him ordaine, as having a further sacramentall power then other Ministers, nor governe with power directiue and correctiue over others. This exceedeth the bounds of all ministeriall power. Thirdly, *Timothie* is not bid to lay on hands or doe any other act, when now churches were constituted, but with concurrence of those churches; *salvo uniuscujusque Ecclesiæ jure*, the Apostles did not otherwise. For though *Paul* wrote to him alone, that was because he was occupied not onely in Churches perfectly framed, but also in the erecting & framing of others. Secondly, because they were in degree and dignity aboue all other ordinary governours of the Church, which their Consul-like preheminence was sufficient, why they should be written to alone.

To the fourth reason: *Those things which were written to informe, not onely Timothy and Titus, but all their successours, who were Diocesan Bishops, those were written to Diocesan Bishops. But these were so. Ergo,* The Proposition is not true, because it presupposeth that nothing written to any persons, can informe Diocesan Bishops, unlesse the persons to whom it is written be formally in that selfe same order. For if one Apostle should write to another touching the duty Apostolique, it might informe any Doctor or Pastor whatsoever. Secondly, we deny Diocesan Bishops are (*de jure*) successours. As for the

equivocall

equivocal Catalogue which maketh all who are read Biſhops to haue been Dioceſan, we ſhall ſpeake of them hereafter. The Biſhops between *Timothy* and *Stephanus* in the time of the *Chalcedom* Councell, were not all of one cut: and there are no churches read in *Crete* which were not Congregations. There is no more to proue *Phillip* of *Gortina* a Metropolitan, then to proue *Ignatius* Metropolitan of Syria. For what doth ſtorie relate, but that *Phillip* was amongſt other a Biſhop of thoſe Churches which were in Crete. There are many Churches in England, a Miniſter of which Churches is ſuch an one, that is one Miniſter amongſt others of thoſe Churches. To that of their reſiding there and dying in theſe Churches. Firſt, the propoſition is not neceſſarie. For as *Iames* might reſide exerciſing an Apoſtolicall inſpection in a particular Church, ſo might theſe exerciſe an Euangeliſticall function how long ſoever they reſided. Secondly, the aſſumption will not be found true for ordinarie conſtant reſidence neither in Scripture nor fathers. For *Timothie*, though he be exhorted to ſtay at Epheſus, yet this doth not argue it, that he was enjoyned ordinary reſidence. For firſt it was a ſigne he was not Biſhop, becauſe *Paul* did exhort him, for he would well haue known, he might not being their ordinary Paſtor leaue them, further then the more important good of the Church ſhould occaſion. 2. He is bid to ſtay there, not finally, but till the Apoſtle ſhould come to him, which though he might be delayed, it is plain he then intended. So *Titus* is placed in *Crete*, not to ſtay there, and ſet downe his reſt, but ἐπιδιορθώσεθαι, further to ſet, as it were, and exedifie the fabricke, which *Paul* had begunne. God gaue Ceremonies μιχρὶ κατῖρον διορθωσεως Διόρθωσις, is not euer a correcting of any thing amiſſe, but a ſetling every thing right, by erecting the ſubſtance foreſhadowed. But ſay it were correcting, it were but ſuch a correction as one might performe *in tranſitu*, with a little longer ſtay, though not ordinary reſidence. By Scripture the contrary is manifeſt.

For firſt, it is not like that *Timothy* was placed Biſhop after *Pauls* being at Rome; for when *Paul* ſaith he prayed him, whē now he was going to Macedonia, to ſtay at Epheſus, he doth intimate that when hee left him they were there both together. Secondly, when he wiſhed him to abide there, he had a meaning to come unto *Timothy* thither where he left him, ſo as at leaſt to call on him, and ſee the Church. But *Paul* after his parting from the Preſbyters knew he ſhould neuer ſee the Epheſians more. *Act.* 20. If wee ſay he doth foretell it for likely, ſo wee may ſay, that of wolues ariſing was, and call all into queſtion. Neither is it likely, but that teares would haue broke his heart, and made him yeeld in the peremptories of his ſpeech, had not his ſoule been divinely perſwaded. Thirdly, he had no meaning when he left them to conſtitute

Timothy

Timothy to be their Biſhop: for he would not haue omitted ſuch an argument of conſolation to hearts ſo heavie. Nor he doth not mention any ſuch purpoſe when he did write to them his Epiſtle. He telleth Churches uſually when himſelfe hath meaning to ſee them, or to ſend others. Fourthly, Timothie was with Paul while he was in bonds at Rome, as witnes thoſe inſcriptions of the Epiſtles to the *Colloſſians* and *Philippians*; yea *Timothy* was ſo with him, as to bee imployed by him, ſent forth, and returne to him, which is manifeſt. *Phillip.* 2. If he were after this placed in *Epheſus*, yet he was not placed to be reſident, for in the end of the Epiſtle, he doth bid *Timothy* come to him, and bring *Marke*, that they might miniſter to him. Againe when he did write the 2 Epiſtle, *Timothie* was not *Epheſus*, for he doth bid him ſalute *Aquila* and *Pricilla* and *Oneſiphorus*. Obj. But is like theſe were at *Epheſus*, for their *Paul* left *Aquila* and *Priſcilla*. They came occaſionally, they did not fixe there, which *Chryſoſtome* alſo judgeth. And the houſe of *Oneſiphorus*, *Bernard* taketh it, was at Iconium in Lycaonia, ſo that it is like he was in his natiue countrey at this time, even Iconium, Liſtra, Derbe, which happily is the cauſe why the Scholaſticall ſtorie doth make him Biſhop of Lyſtra, becauſe hither he was laſt ſent. He was ſo here, as that the Apoſtle did but ſend him to ſee them, for hee biddeth him come before winter. Beſides, there are many probabilities hee was not at *Epheſus*, for he ſpeaketh of it through the Epiſtle, as a place now remote from him. *Thou knoweſt what Oneſiphorus did for me at Epheſus*, not *where now thou are. I haue ſent Tychius to Epheſus*, not *to thee*, to ſupply thy place while thou ſhalt bee abſent. Finally, after *Paules* death he did not returne to Epheſus, but by common conſent went to *Iohn* the Apoſtle, and very little before his death came to Epheſus, if ever. As for the Fathers therfore in this point, if they teſtifie ordinarie reſidence, which they doe not, wee haue libertie to renounce them; but they teſtifie onely that he remained in that Church, becauſe his ſtay was longer there then Euangeliſts did uſe to make, and he is thought to haue ſuffered martyrdome there. So for *Titus*, when *Paul* ſent him to Crete to doe that worke is uncertaine; but this is certaine, it was before his writing to the Corinths the ſecond time, and going to Rome. This likewiſe, that *Paul* was then in travelling, & as it is like being in the parts of Macedonia did meane to winter at *Nicopolis*. When he did write the Epiſtle he doth ſhew it was not his meaning that *Titus* ſhould ſtay there, for he doth bid him to meet him at Nicopolis, where he meant to be as it is likely, but *Titus* comming did not meet him there but at length found him in Macedonia, whence *Paul* did ſend him to the Corinthians, *thanking God for his promptneſſe even of his own accord to be imployed among ſt them*, 2. *Cor.* 8. 16. which doth

ſhew

ſhew he had not been made an ordinarie Biſhop any where. We find that he did accompany *Paul* at Rome, 2. *Tim.* 4. 10. and when *Paul* writ his ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, he was in Dalmatia. Whence *Aquinas* doth thinke him to haue been Biſhop of that place. Wherefore we thinke him that will be carried from ſuch preſumptions, (yea manifeſt arguments) by *Hegeſippus*, *Clemens*, and hiſtorie grounded on them, to be too much affected to ſo weak authors, and wiſh not credit with him, who counts him unworthy credit, that will not ſweare what ſuch men depoſe.

Touching the proofe that followeth. *That either their function was Euangeliſticall and extraordinarie, or ordinarie. But their function as aſſigned to thoſe Churches was not extraordinary.* We deny this aſſumption, with the proofe of it. *That the function that theſe exerciſed as aſſigned to certain Churches (theſe two by name) was neceſſary to the being of the Church.* The reaſon is, becauſe they were aſſigned to doe thoſe things which are to be done for ever in the church after a more tranſcendent manner; viz. as Euangeliſts; and aſſignation of them to doe thoſe things in certaine Churches after this manner, was not neceſſarie to perpetuate the being of the Church. Aſſignation to churches to doe the work of ordinarie Paſtors is indeed neceſſarie: not aſſignation to doe the worke of Euangeliſts.

To that finall reaſon, what antiquity doth teſtifie agreeing with Scriptures is true, and ſo to be taken. What they ſpeak ſo agreeing, that it is virtually conteyned in them, and may rightly be deduced from them, is to be beleeved and received by a divine faith. But what they ſpeake not plainly contradicted, but yet no way included, may be admitted *fide humana*, if the firſt relators be well qualified witneſſes. But what they ſpeake from ſuch as *Clement* and *Hegeſippus*, it is in effect of light credulity. A corrupt conſcience bent to decline is glad of every colour which it may pretend to juſtifie it ſelfe in declyning.

To the aſſumption we anſwer. What doe not ſome ancient enough call *Timothy*? *Ambroſe* ſaith he was a *Deacon* one while, a *Preſbyter* another while, and in like ſenſe a *Primate* and a *Biſhop*. *Lyra* proveth him from many authorities to haue been an Arch-biſhop, and *Titus* a Prieſt. *Beda* calleth him an *Apoſtle*. But to gather on theſe, that he was in proprietie of ſpeech all theſe, were abſurd. Obj. I, but they call him Biſhop on other grounds, becauſe aſſigned to this Church. Anſ. They call him Biſhop becauſe he was aſſigned to this Church, not onely to teach, but alſo to ordeyne *Deacons Preſbyters*. For whereſoever they found this done, and by whomſoever, they did call them Biſhops, as I noted before from *Oecumen.* The fathers therfore may be well conſtrued calling theſe Biſhops, becauſe they made longer ſtay in theſe Churches then Euangeliſts did uſually, & did preach

and ordaine, and doe in these Churches all such things which Bishops in their time used to doe. But that he was not an Euangelist, and more then an ordinary Bishop they doe not deny. *Salmeron* himselfe in his first Disputation on 1. *Tim.pag.*405. *Videtur ergo quod fuerit plusquam Episcopus, etiamsi ad tempus in ea civitate ut Pastor prædicaverit & sacros ordines promoverit, unde quidem vocant eum Episcopum.* Finally, should they in rigour and formall propriety make him an ordinarie Pastor, from the first time *Paul* did write to him, ordinarily resident to his end; they should testifie a thing, as I hope I haue shewed, contrary to Scripture, yea contrarie to that text which maketh him to haue done the worke of an Euangelist. As for the shew from the Subscriptions we haue spoken sufficiently.

Now to shew that they were not properly Bishops. First, we haue shewed that they were but subrogated to do those supposed Epistopall duties a while, but were not there fixed, to make their ordinary abode. Therfore not Bishops properly. Secondly, they who did the work of an Euangelist in all that they did, did not perform formally the worke of a Bishop. But these did so. As is vouched of *Timothy, Doe the worke of an Euangelist.* Ergo. The Proposition is proved. If an Euangelist & Bishop cannot be formally of one office, then the act of an Euangelist, and the act of an ordinarie Pastor or Bishop cannot be formally one. For when everie thing doth *agere secundum quod actu est*, those things which are not the same formally, their worke and effect cannot be formally the same. But the Euangelist and the ordinarie Pastor or Bishops, are not formally the same. Ergo. The assumption the Apostle proveth, by that distinct enumeration of those whom Christ gaue now ascending, by the work of the Ministerie to gather and build his Church. For as an Apostle is distinguished from a Prophet, a Prophet from an Euangelist, so an Euangelist from an ordinary Teacher.

Object. But it may be said, they were not distinct, but that the superiour contained the inferiour, and Apostles might be Euangelists properly, as *Matthew* and *Iohn* were.

Answ. That former point is to be understood with a graine of salt. The superiour contained the inferiour virtually and eminently, in as much as they could doe *altiori tamen ratione*, what the inferiour did. This sense is tollerable. But that formallie the power of all other offices suites which the Apostles is false. My Lord chiefe Iustice of England is not formally a Constable. As for the latter, true, an Apostle might be also a penman of the Gospell, but this maketh not an Euangelist no more then an Apostle, but doth *per accidens*, come to them both. And even as a Preacher or Pastor, writing Commentaries, and publishing other Treatises, this cometh *per accidens* to his calling, it doth not make him a Pastor, but more il-

luſtrious and fruitfull in that regard then another. So *Marke* and *Luke* was not therefore Euangeliſts becauſe they did write the Goſpels, for then none ſhould haue been Euangeliſts that had not written, but in this regard they were more renowmed then other. Cuſtome hath to prevailed, ſaith *Maldonate* in his Preface on *Matthew*, that we call them Euangeliſts, (*viz.* the Writers of the Goſpels) whom the Scriptures never call Euangeliſts. Theſe Euangeliſts *Paul* ſpeaketh of were given at Chriſts aſcenſion, but the firſt writer of the Goſpell, being an Apoſtle, was at leaſt eight yeares after. Secondly, they were a diſtinct order of workemen from the Apoſtles, but two of the penmen of the Goſpels were Apoſtles. Thirdly, they were ſuch as by labour of miniſterie (common for the generall of it to all the other) did gather Saints, and build Chriſts Bodie. Now writing the Goſpell was not a labour of Miniſterie common to Apoſtles, Prophets, Euangeliſts, Paſtors, but the publiſhing of it.

Thoſe degrees which Chriſt did diſtinctly giue to otherſome, and otherſome, thoſe he did not giue conjoynedly to one and the ſame perſons. But theſe callings he gaue to ſome one, to others another. Elſe he muſt haue ſaid, he gaue the ſame men to be Apoſtles and Euangeliſts, the ſame to be Euangeliſts and Paſtors. Ergo.

That Calling which is not compatible with the Calling of an Euangeliſt, that *Paul* never annexed to an Euangeliſt. But the Calling of a Biſhop is ſuch. For a Biſhop is tyed to a particular Church. The Calling of an Euangeliſt is a Calling whereby one is called to the worke of the Miniſterie, to gather Saints, and edifie, Chriſts body, without any limitation to any particular Church. Ergo, *Paul* never annexed the Calling of a Biſhop to an Euangeliſt.

The Calling of an Euangeliſt is not to write the Goſpell, nor to preach it ſimply: for then every Miniſter of the Word ſhould be an Euangeliſt. But this doth difference them, to preach it without limitation or aſſignation to any particular church. Thus *Phillip*, thus all thoſe who were the Apoſtles helpers, working the work of the Lord as they did were Euang. of which ſort ſome continued to the time of *Commodus* the Emperour, as *Euſebius* reporteth, *Euſeb. hiſt. li. 5. cap. 9.* Now a Calling wherby I am thus called to publiſh the Goſpel, without fixing my ſelfe in any certain place; and a Calling which bindeth during life to ſettle my ſelfe in one Church, are incompatible.

Laſtly, that which would haue debaſed *Timothy* and *Titus*, that *Paul* did not put upon them. But to haue brought them from the honour of ſerving the Goſpell, as *Collaterall* companions of the Apoſtles, to be ordinary Paſtors, had abaſed them. Ergo, this to be ordinary Paſtors *Paul* did not put upon them. *Obj.* The aſſumption is denyed, it was no abaſement. For before they were but Preſbyters, and afterward by impoſition of hands were made Biſhops.

why should they receive imposition of hands, and a new ordination, if they did not retein an ordinarie calling? we meane if they were not admitted into ordinary functions by imposition of hands. I answer, This deny all with all whereon it is builded is grosse: For, to bring them from a Superiour order to an Inferiour, is to abase them. But the Euangelists office was superiour to Pastors. Ergo. The assumption proved. First, Every office is so much the greater, by how much the power of it is of ampler extent and lesse restrained. But the Euangelists power of teaching and governing was illimitted. Ergo. The assumption proved. Where ever an Apostle did that part of Gods worke which belonged to an Apostle; there an Euangelist might doe that which belonged to him. But that part of Gods work which belonged to an Apostle he might doe any where, without limitation. Ergo. Secondly, Every Minister by how much he doth more approximate to the highest, by so much he is higher. But the companions, & coadjutors of the Apostles, were neerer then ordinarie Pastors. Ergo. Who are next the King, in his Kingdome, but those who are *Regis Comites*. The Euangelists were *Comites* of these Ecclesiasticall Cheiftaines. *Chrysostome* doth expresly say on *Ephes.* 4. That the Euangelists in an ambulatorie course spreading the Gospell, were aboue any Bishop or Pastor which resteth in a certain Church. Wherefore to make them Presbyters is a weake conceite. For, every Presbyter (properly so called) was constituted in a certain Church to doe the work of the Lord in a certaine Church. But Euangelists were not, but to doe the worke of the Lord in any Church as they should be occasioned. Ergo, they were no Presbyters properly so called. Now for their ordination; *Timothie* received none as the Doctor conceiveth, but what hee had from the hand of the Apostle and Presbyters, when now he was taken of *Paul* to be his companion. For no doubt but the Church which gaue him a good testimony, did by her Presbyters concurre with *Paul* in his promoting to that office. Obj. What, could they lay on hands with the Apostles, which *Phillip* could not, and could they enter one into an extraordinary office? Ans. They did lay on hands with the Apostles, as it is expresly read, both of the Apostles and them. It is one thing to use precatorie imposition, another to use miraculous imposition, such as the Apostles did, whereby the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost were conferred. In the first, Presbyters haue power. Neither is it certaine, that *Phillip* could not haue imposed hands, and given the Holy Ghost. For though he could, he might choose in wisedom for their greater confirmation and edification to let that bee done by persons more eminent. Finally, imposition of hands may be used in promoting and setting one forth to an extraordinarie office.

For

For every extraordinarie office is not attended with immediate vocation from God. As the calling of Evangeliſts, though extraordinarie, was in this unlike the calling of Apoſtles and Prophets. Secondly, men called immediatly may be promoted to the more fruitfull exerciſe of their immediate and extraordinarie callings by impoſition of hands from their inferiours, as *Paul* and *Barnabas* were. Howſoever, it is plaine, that *Timothie* by impoſition of hands, was ordained to no calling, but the calling of an Evangeliſt. For that calling he was ordained to, which he is called on by *Paul* to exerciſe, and fully execute. But hee is called on by him to doe the work of an Evangeliſt. Ergo, that calling he was ordained to.

That work which exceedeth the calling of an ordinarie Biſhop, was not put upon an ordinarie Biſhop. But *Titus* his work did ſo: for it was to plant Preſbyters towne by towne through a Nation. Ergo. For the ordinarie plantation and erecting of Churches to their due frame, exceedeth the calling of an ordinarie Biſhop. But this was *Titus* his worke. Ergo. Biſhops are given to particular Churches when now they are framed, that they may keepe them winde and wether tight, they are not to lay foundations, or to exedifie ſome imperfect beginnings. But ſay *Titus* had been a Biſhop: he is no warrant for ordinarie Biſhops, but for Primates, whoſe authoritie did reach through whole Ilands. Nay, if the Doctors rule out of *Theodoret* were good, it would ſerve for a Biſhop of the pluralitie cut. For it is ſayd he placed Preſbyters citie by citie, or town by towne, who are in name onely Biſhops, but not that hee placed Angels, or Apoſtles, in any part of it. He therefore was the ſole Biſhop of them, the reſt were but Preſbyters, ſuch as had the name, not the office and government of Biſhops.

Finally, were it granted that they were ordinarie Biſhops, and written to doe the things that Biſhops doe, yet would it not bee a ground for their majoritie of power in matter ſacramentall and juriſdiction, as is aboue excepted.

The fifth Argument.

The Miniſters which the Church had generally and perpetually the firſt 300. yeares after Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and was not ordained by any generall Councell, were undoubtedly of Apoſtolicall inſtitution. But the Church ever had Dioceſan Biſhops in ſingularitie of preheminence during life, and in maioritie of power of ordination and juriſdiction above others, and theſe not inſtituted by generall Councels. Ergo. The propoſition is plain both by *Auſtin de Bapt. contra Donat. lib. 4. & Epiſt. 118.* and by *Tertul. Conſtat id ab Apoſtolis traditum quod apud Eccleſias Apoſtolorum fuit ſacroſanctum.* For who can thinke that all the Churches generally, would conſpire to aboliſh the order of Chriſt planted by the Apoſtles, and

ſet up other miniſters then Chriſt had ordained. The aſſumption is plaine: for if the Church had Metropolitans anciently, and from the beginning, as the Councell of Nice teſtifieth, much more Biſhops. For Dioceſan Biſhops muſt be before them, they riſing of combination of Cities and Diocies. And the councell of Epheſus teſtifieth, the government of thoſe Biſhops of Cyprus, to haue been ever from the beginning, according to the cuſtom of old received. Yea that the attempt of the Biſhop of Antioch, was againſt the Canons of the Apoſtles. Again, *Cyprian* doth teſtifie, that long before his time, Biſhops were placed in all provinces and Cities, beſides the ſucceſſion of Biſhops from the Apoſtles times: for they prove their originall to haue been in the Apoſtles times. Neither were they inſtituted by any generall Councell. For long before the firſt generall Councell, we read Metropolitans to have been ordained in the Churches. Yea *Ierom* himſelfe is of opinion, that no Councell of after times, but the Apoſtles themſelues did ordaine Biſhops; for even ſince thoſe contentions wherein ſome ſaid, *I am Pauls, others, I am Apollos*, they were ſet up by generall decree: which could not be made, but by the Apoſtles themſelues. And in *Pſal. 44.* he maketh *David* to propheſie of Biſhops, who ſhould be ſet up as the Apoſtles Succeſſors.

Anſwer.

First, we deny the propoſition. For firſt; this doth preſuppoſe ſuch an aſſiſtance of Gods ſpirit with the Church, that ſhe cannot generally take up any cuſtome, or opinion, but what hath Apoſtolicall warrant, whereas the contrary may be ſhewed in many inſtances. Keeping of holy dayes was a generall practiſe through the Churches, before any Councell enacted it, yet was no Apoſtolicall tradition. *Socrat. lib. 5. cap. 22. Evangelium non impoſuit hoc, ut dies feſti obſerventur, ſed homines ipſi ſuis quique locis ex more quodam introduxerunt.* Taking the Euchariſt faſting, the faſts on wedneſday, and Saturday, faſting in ſome faſhion before Eaſter, ceremonies in Baptiſing, the government of Metropolitans were generally received before any Councel eſtabliſhed.

2 It doth preſuppoſe, that the Church cannot generally conſpire in taking up any cuſtome, if ſhe be not led into it by ſome generall proponent, as a generall repreſentative Councell, or the Apoſtles, who were Oecumenicall Doctors, but I ſee no reaſon for ſuch a preſumption.

3 This doth preſuppoſe, that ſomething may bee which is of Apoſtolicall authoritie, which neither directly nor conſequentlie is included in the word written. For when there are ſome cuſtomes which haue been generall, which yet cannot bee grounded in the word written, it is neceſſarie by this propoſition, that ſome things may

may be in the Church having authoritie Apoſtolicall, as being delivered by word unwritten. For they cannot haue warrant from the the Apoſtles but by word written or unwritten. To the proofe, we anſwer: That of *Tertullian* maketh not to the purpoſe, for hee ſpeaketh of that which was in Churches Apoſtolicall, as they were now planted by them, which the ſentence at large ſet downe will make cleare. *Si conſtat id bonum quod prius, & id prius quod eſt ab initio, ab initio quod ab Apoſtolis, pariter utiq; conſtabit id eſſe ab Apoſtolis traditum quod apud Eccleſias Apoſtolorum fuerit ſacroſanctum.* Touching *Auſtins* rule, we would ask what is the meaning of theſe words, *Non niſi Apoſtolica authoritate traditum rectiſſimè creditur.* If they ſay his meaning is, that ſuch a thing cannot but in their writings be delivered, they doe pervert his meaning, as is apparent by that, *Cont. Don. lib. 2. 27. Conſuetudinem ex Apoſtolorum traditione venientem, ſicut multa non inveniuntur in literis eorum, & tamen quia cuſtodiuntur per univerſam Eccleſiam, non niſi ab ipſis tradita & commendata creduntur.* And we wiſh them to ſhew from Scripture what they ſay is contained in it. If they yeeld, he doth mean as he doth of unwritten tradition, we hope they will not iuſtifie him in this; we will take that libertie in him, which himſelfe doth in all others, and giveth us good leave to uſe in his owne writings. Now count him in this to favour Traditions, as ſome of the Papiſts do not cauſeleſly make this rule the meaſuring cord, which doth take in the latitude of all traditions: yet wee appeale to *Auſtines* judgement otherwhere, who though by this rule hee maketh a univerſall practiſe not begun by Councels, an argument of Divine and Apoſtolicall authoritie, yet dealing againſt Donatiſts, Lib. 1. Don. cap. 7. hee ſayth, he will not uſe this argument, becauſe it was but humane and uncertaine, *ne videar humanis argumentis illud probare, ex Evangelio profera certa documenta.*

Wee anſwer to the aſſumption two things: Firſt, it cannot bee proved, that univerſally there were ſuch Dioceſan Biſhops as ours. For in the Apoſtles times it cannot bee proved, that Churches which they planted were divided into a mother Church, and ſome Parochiall Churches. Now while they governed together in common with Preſbyters, and that but one congregation, they could not bee like our Dioceſan Biſhops. And though there bee doubtfull relations, that Rome was divided under *Evariſtus*, yet this was not common through the Church. For *Tripartite* ſtory teſtifieth, that till the time of *Sozomen*, they did in ſome parts continue together. Trip. hiſt. lib. 1. cap. 19. Secondly, thoſe Biſhops which had no more but one Deacon to helpe them in their miniſterie toward their Churches, they could not be Dioceſan Biſhops. But ſuch in many parts the Apoſtles planted, as *Epiphanius* doth teſtifie. Ergo.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, such Countries as did use to have Bishops in villages and little towns, could not have Diocesan Bishops. But such there were after the Apostles times in Cyprus and Arabia, as *Sozom.* in his 7. book, cap. 19. testifieth. Ergo, Diocesan Bishops were never so universally received. Secondly, Bishops came to bee common by a Councell, sayth *Ambrose*, *Prospiciente Concilio*. *Amb. in 4. ad Eph.* or by a Decree passing through the world: *toto orbe decretum est*, sayth *Ierom ad Evag.* which is to be considered, not of one Oecumenicall Councell, but distributively, in that singular Churches did in their Presbyteries decree, and that so, that one for the most part followed another in it. This *interpretativè*, though not *formaliter*, is a generall decree. But to thinke this was a decree of *Pauls*, is too too absurd. For besides that the Scripture would not have omitted a decree of such importance, as tended to the alteration of and consummation of the frame of Churches begun through all the world, How could *Ierom* (if this decree were the Apostles) conclude that Bishops were aboue Presbyters, *magis consuetudine Ecclesiæ*, then *Dominicæ dispositionis veritate*. If the Doct. do except, that *custome* is here put for *Apostolicall institution*; let him put in one for the other, and see how well it will become the sense. *Let Bishops know they are greater then Priests, rather by the Decree of the Apostle, then by the truth of Christs disposition.* Is it not fine, that the Apostles should be brought in as opposites, facing Christ their Lord? And this conclusion of *Ierom* doth make me think that *decretum est* imported no more, then that it was took up in time for custome through the world. Which is elegantly said to be a decree, because custome groweth in time to obtaine *vim legis*, the force of a decree. But *Ambrose* his place is plain, *Prospiciente Cõcilio*, he meaneth not a councel held by Apostles. For he maketh this provision by Coũcel to haue come in, when now in Egypt & Alexandria, Presbyters according to the custome of that Church, were not found fit to succeed each other, but they chose out of their presbyteries men of best desert. Now to *Heraclas* and *Donysius*, ther were a succession of Presbyters in the Church of Alexandria, as *Eusebius* and *Ierom* both affirme. Wherefore briefly, seeing no such universall custome can be proved, all the godly fathers never conspired to abolish Christs institution. Secondly, could a custome have prevailed with all of them, whom we have to *Constantines* time, yet it might enter and steale upon them through humaine frailtie, as these errours in doctrine did upon many otherwise godly and faithfull Martyrs: the rather because the alteration was so little at the first, and Aristocraticall government was still continued. Thirdly, say, they had wittingly and willingly done it through the world, they had not conspired, because they might haue deemed such power in the Church, and themselves to doe nothing but what they might

with

with Chriſts good liking for the ediſication of it. How many of the chiefe Patrons of this cauſe, are at this day of this iudgement, that if it were but an Apoſtolical inſtitution, as Apoſtolical is cõtradiſtinguiſhed to divine, they might change it. But if the Apoſtles did enact this order, as Legats and Embaſſadors of Chriſt, then is it not theirs, but Chriſts own inſtitution. What an Embaſſador ſpeaketh as an Embaſſadour, it is principally from him that ſent him: but if they who were Legates, did not bearing the perſon of Legats, but of ordinary Eccleſiaſticall governours, decree this; then it is certaine, Church governours may alter it without treaſonable conſpiring againſt Chriſt.

As for thoſe proofes, that Biſhops have been throughout all Churches from the beginning, they are weak. For firſt, the Councell of Nice uſeth ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, not *ſimpliciter*, but *ſecundum quid*, in order happily to that time wherein the cuſtome began, which was better known to them then to us: the phraſe is ſo uſed, *Act.* 15. 8. in reſpect of ſome things which had not continued many years. They cannot meane the Apoſtles times, for then Metropolitans ſhould haue actuallie been from the Apoſtles time. Secondlie, the phraſe of the Councell of Epheſus, is likewiſe æquivocall; for they have reference to the fathers of Nice, or at leaſt the decrees of the fathers, who went before the Councell of Nice. For thoſe words being added, *definitiones Nicenæ fidei*, ſeeme to explaine the former, *Canones Apoſtolorum*. It is plaine the decree of the Councell doth aſcribe this thing onely to ancient cuſtome, no leſſe then that of Nice, Conſtantinople and Chalcedon; and therefore cannot riſe to the authoritie of ſacred Scriptures. Let him ſhew in all antiquitie where ſacred ſcriptures are called Canons of the Apoſtles. Finally, if this phraſe note rules given by the Apoſtles, then the Apoſtles themſelves did ſet out the bounds of Cyprus and Antioch. As for the authoritie of *Cyprian*, he doth teſtifie what was *Communiter* in his time, Biſhops ordained in cities; not *univerſaliter*, as if there were no citie but had ſome. Secondly, he ſpeaketh of Biſhops who had their Churches included in Cities, not more then might meet together in one, to any common deliberations. They had no Dioceſan Churches, nor were Biſhops who had majoritie of rule over their Preſbyters, nor ſole power of ordination. As for the Catalogue of ſucceſſion, it is *pompæ aptior quam pugnæ*; Rome can recite their ſucceſſours. But becauſe it hath had Biſhops, Ergo, Oecumenicall Biſhops is no conſequence. All who are named Biſhops in the Catalogue, were not of one cut, and in that ſence we controvert.

Touching that which doth improve their being conſtituted by any Councell, it is very weak. For though wee read of no generall

Councell, yet there might be, and the report not come to us. Secondly, we have shewed, that the Councell of Nice doth not prove this, that Bishops were every where from the beginning; the phrase of *from the beginning*, beeing there respectively, not absolutely used. Neither doth *Ierom* ever contrary this: for he doth not use those words in proprietie, but by way of allusion; otherwise if hee did think the Apostle had published this decree, when the first to the Corinths was written, how can he cite testimonies long after written, to prove that Bishops were not instituted in the Apostles time, but that they were ordained by the Church *iure Ecclesiastico*, when the time served for it.

The sixt Argument.

Such as even at this day are in the reformed Churches, such ministers are of Christs institution. But ministers hauing singularitie of preheminence and power above others, are amongst them; as the Superintendents in Germanie. Ergo. *Answ.* The assumption is utterly denied. For Superintendents in Germany are nothing like our Bishops: they are of the same degree with other ministers, they are onely Presidents while the Synod lasteth; when it is dissolved, their prerogative ceaseth: they have no prerogative over their fellow Ministers; they are subject to the Presbyteries, *Zepp. lib. 2. cap. 10. pag. 324.* The Synod ended, they returne to the care of their particular Churches.

The seventh Argument.

If it were necessarie that while the Apostles lived there should be such Ministers as had preheminence and maioritie of power above others, much more after their departure. But they thought it necessarie, and therefore appointed *Timothy* and *Titus*, and other Apostolicke men furnished with such power. Ergo, much more after their departure. *Answ.* The assumption is denied, and formerly disproved: for they appointed no such Apostolick men with Episcopal power, in which they should be succeeded.

The eighth Argument.

Such Ministers as were in the Apostles times not contradicted by them, were lawfull. For they would not have held their peace, had they known unlawfull Ministers to have crept into the Churches.

But there were before *Iohns* death in many Churches a succession of Diocesan Bishops, as in Rome, *Linus*, *Clemens*, at Ierusalem *Iames*, *Simeon*, at Antioch, *Evodius*, at Alexandria, S. *Mark*, *Anianus*, *Abilius*. Ergo, Diocesan Bishops be lawfull.

Answer. The Assumption is denied: for these Bishops were but Pres-

Preſbyters, Paſtors of one congregation ordinarily meeting, governing with common conſent of their Preſbyteries. If they were affecting our Biſhops majoritie, they were in *Diotrophes* ſufficientlie contradicted.

The ninth Argument.

Thoſe who have been ever held of a higher order then Preſbyters, they are before Preſbyters in preheminence, and maioritie of rule. But Biſhops have been held in a higher order by all antiquitie. Ergo. The aſſumption is manifeſt: In the Councell of Nice, Ancyra, Sardica, Antioch miniſters are diſtinguiſhed into three orders. *Ignatius, Clemens* in his Epiſtle to *Iames, Dionyſ. Areopag. de Cœleſt. Hierom. cap.* 5. *Tertull. de fuga in perſecutione, & de Baptiſmo. Ignatius* doth often teſtifie it. No wonder, when the ſcripture it ſelfe doth call one of theſe a ſtep to another, 1. Timoth. 3. 13. Cyprian. Lib. 4. Ep. 2. Counc. Epheſ. Cap. 1. 2. 6. Yea the Councell of Chalcedon counteth it ſacriledge, to reduce a Biſhop to the degree of a Preſbyter. This *Hierome* himſelfe confirmeth, ſaying: That from *Marke* to *Heraclas* and *Dionyſius*, the Presbyters did ſet a Biſhop over them in higher degree.

Anſwer.

The Propoſition is not true in regard of maioritie of rule. For no Apoſtle had ſuch power over the meaneſt Deacon in any of the Churches. But to the Aſſumption wee anſwer by diſtinction. An order is reputed higher, either becauſe intrinſecallie it hath a higher vertue, or becauſe it hath a higher degree of dignitie and honour. Now wee deny that ever antiquitie did take the Biſhop above his Presbyters to bee in a higher order then a Presbyter, further then a higher order doth ſignifie an order of higher dignitie and honour, τάξις or βάθμος μειζόνης τιμῆς, as the Councell of Sardica ſpeaketh. Which is further proved: becauſe the fathers did not hold a Biſhop to differ from a Presbyter, as Presbyter from a Deacon. For theſe differ *genere proximo; Noverint Diaconi ſe ad miniſterium non ad ſacerdotium vocari.* But a Biſhop differeth from a Presbyter, as from one who hath the power of Prieſthood no leſſe then himſelfe, and therefore the difference betwixt theſe, muſt bee circumſtantiall, not ſo eſſentiall as betwixt the other. Thus Biſhops and Archbiſhops are divers orders of Biſhops, not that one exceedeth the other, as a power of higher vertue, but of higher dignitie then then the other. More plainly; There may be a fourefold difference *in gradu. 1. in poteſtate gradus. 2. in Exercitio. 3. in Dignitate. 4. in amplitudine Juriſdictionis.* The firſt difference is not betweene a Biſhop and a Preſbyter, ac-

cording to the common tenent of antiquitie, or the Schoole, but only is maintained by such as hold the Character of a Priest aud Bishop inwardlie. diverse one from the other. For as a Bishop differeth not in power and degree from an Archbishop. Because nothing an Archbishop can doe, as confirming, consecrating Bishops, &c. but a Bishop can doe also. So neither doth a Presbyter from a Bishop. *Obiect.* But the Priest cannot ordaine a Presbyter, and confirme as the Bishop doth, and therefore differeth *potestate gradus*. To this I answer, that these authours meane not this difference in power (*de fundamentali & remota potestate, sed ampliata, immediata, et iam actu horum effectuum productiva*) as if Presbyters had not a remote and fundamentall power to doe those things: but that they haue not, before they be ordained bishops, their power so enlarged, as to produce these effects actuallie. As a boy hath the generative facultie while he is a child, which he hath when he is a man, but yet it is not in a child, free from all impediment, that it can actually beget the like. But this is too much to grant. For the power sacramentall in the Priest, is an actuall power which hee is able to performe and execute, nothing defectiue in regard of them, further then they be with-held from the exercise of it. For that cause which standeth in compleat actualitie to greater & more noble effects, hath an inferior & lesser of the same kind under it also, unlesse the application of the matter be intercepted. Thus a presbyter he hath a sacramental power standing in ful actualitie to higher sacramental actions, & therfore cannot but have these inferior of confirmation and orders in his power, further then they are excepted & kept from bein applied to him. And therfore power sacramentall cannot bee in a Presbyter, as the generative facultie is in a child, for this is inchoate onely, and imperfect, such as cannot produce that effect. The power of the Priest is compleat. Secondlie, I say, these are no sacramentall actions. Thirdlie, were they, yet as much may bee said to prove an Archbishop a distinct order from a Bishop, as to prove a Presbyter and Bishop differing in order. For it is proper to him out of power to generate a Bishop, other Bishops laying on hands, no otherwise then Presbyters are said to doe, where they ioyne with their Bishops. If that rule stand not *maior ad minori*, nor yet *equalis ab equali*, I marvel how Bishops can beget Bishops equal, yea superior to them, as in consecrating the Lord Archbishop, & yet a presbyter may not ordain a presbyter. It doth not stand with their Episcopall majoritie, that the rule (*every one may give that which he hath*) should hold here in the exercise of their power. Those who are in one order, may differ *jure divino* or *humano*. Aaron differed from the Priests not in power sacramentall, for they might all offer incence, and make intercession. But the solemne intercession in the holy of holies

God did except and appropriate to the high Prieſt the type of Chriſt. Prieſts would haue reached to this power of interceſſion in the holy place, or any act of like kinde: but that God did not permit that this ſhould come under them, or they intermeddle in it. Thus by humane law the Biſhop is greater in exerciſe then the Prieſt. For though God hath not excepted any thing from the one free to the other, yet commonly confirmation, ordination, abſolution by impoſing hands in receiving Penitents, conſecrating Churches and Virgines, haue been referred to the Biſhop for the honour of Prieſthood, rather then any neceſſity of law, as *Ierome* ſpeaketh. Finally, in dignity, thoſe may differ many wayes, who in degree are equall, which is granted by our adverſaries in this cauſe. Yea, they ſay, in amplitude of juriſdiction, as in which it is apparant an Archbiſhop exceedeth another. But were it manifeſt that God did giue Biſhops Paſtorall power through their Dioceſſe, and an Archbiſhop through his Province, though but when he viſiteth, this would make one differ in order from the other; as in this regard Euangeliſts differred from ordinary Paſtors. But that juriſdiction is in one more then another, is not eſtabliſhed, nor hath apparencie in any Scripture.

To the proofes therefore I anſwer briefly: the one may be a ſtep to the other, while they differ in degrees of dignities, though eſſentially they are but one and the ſame order. In this regard it may be ſacriledge to reduce one, from the greater to the leſſer, if he haue not deſerued it. As for that of *Ierom* it is moſt plain, he did meane no further order, but onely in reſpect of ſome dignities wherewith they inveſted their Biſhop, or firſt Preſbyter, as that they did mount him up in a higher ſeate, the reſt ſitting lower about him, and gaue him this preheminence, to ſit firſt, as a Conſul in the Senate, and moderate the carriage of things amongſt them: this *Celſiori gradu*, being nothing but his honourable πρωεδρία, not importing ſole authoritie. For by a Canon of the Councill of Laodicea, we finde that the Biſhop had this priuiledge to ſit firſt, though Preſbyters did together with him enter, and ſit as Iudges of equall commiſſion. For though Deacons ſtood, Preſbyters did alwaies ſit *in circuitu Epiſcopi*.

10 *Argument.*

If Biſhops be that which *Aaron*, and the Apoſtles were, and Preſbyters, be that which the Prieſts, and the 72 Diſciples were, then the one are aboue the other in preheminence and power. But they are ſo. See *Ierom* to *Nepotian.* Ergo.

Anſwer.

If Biſhops &c. and Preſbyters, be that which the ſonnes of *Aaron* and the 72 were, then there are different orders &c. To theſe

may be added a third. That which *Moſes* and the 70 Seniors were, that are the Biſhops and Preſbyters. Firſt, for the propoſition it is not true, for firſt of *Aaron* and his ſonnes, they were not orders differents eſſentially in their power, but onely in degree of dignitie, wherein the high Prieſt was aboue others. For every Prieſts power would haue reached to that act which was reſerved to the high Prieſt onely. Beſides, when the high Prieſt was deceaſed or removed, the other Prieſts did conſecrate the ſucceſſour, as *Sadock*. Finally, the one had for ſubſtance the ſame conſecration that the other, neither had the high Prieſt any maiorite of directiue or correctiue power over others. So the Apoſtles, and 72, will not be found different in order; and therefore thoſe who reſemble theſe cannot be concluded to be of divers orders. For the Apoſtles and 72, differ no more then ordinary meſſengers who are imployed in a ſet courſe, and extraordinary ſent by occaſion onely: They were both meſſengers, the Apoſtles *habitu* and abidingly, the other in act onely, and after a tranſitorie manner.

Againe, had *Aaron* and his ſonnes been divers orders, differing eſſentially in the inward power of them, yet is not the propoſition true, but with addition in this wiſe. Thoſe who are identically and formally that which *Aaron* and the Apoſtles were, and that which his ſonnes, and the 72 were, they differ in degree eſſentially, not thoſe who were this analogically by reaſon of ſome imperfect reſemblance. For things may be ſaid to be thoſe things wherewith they haue but imperfect ſimilitude. In this ſenſe onely the propoſition is true.

Now to come to the aſſumption. Firſt, touching *Aaron*, wee deny any Biſhop is as *Aaron* by divine Inſtitution, or by perfect ſimilitude anſwering to him. But becauſe *Aaron* was the firſt and high Prieſt, others inferiour: ſo it hath pleaſed the Church to imitate this pollicie, and make the Biſhop, as it were *Primum Preſbyterum* or *Antiſtitem in primo ordine*, Preſbyters *in ſecundo*, Whence Biſhops may be ſaid to be that which *Aaron* was through the Churches ordination, which ſhe framed, looking to this patterne of government which God himſelfe had ſet out in the old Teſtament. The fathers call them *Aaron* and his ſonnes onely for ſome common analogie, which through the ordinance of the Church aroſe betwixt the Biſhop and Preſbyters, and them; and conceiue them to be ſo by humane accommodation, not by divine inſtitution. But that they were ſo properly ſucceeding them as orders of Miniſterie typified by them by Gods owne appointment, this the fathers never thought. Chriſts prieſthood, no mans, was properly typified in *Aaron*.

So

So touching the other part of the aſſumption. That Biſhops and Preſbyters are what Apoſtles, and the 72 were. The fathers, many of them, inſiſt in this proportion, that as the Apoſtles and 72 were teachers, the one in a higher, the other in an inferiour order, ſo Biſhops and Preſbyters, were by the Churches ordinance. This is the fathers phraſe, to call them Apoſtles, who in any manner reſemble the Apoſtles, to call them, as *Ambroſe*. *Prophets, Euangeliſts, Paſtors, Doctors*, who reſemble theſe, and come in ſome common analogie neereſt them, *Moſes* and the 70 Seniors, who in any ſort reſembled them. Now the aſſumption granted in this ſenſe maketh not againſt us. For they might be ſaid theſe, if there were but diverſe degrees of dignity amongſt them, though for power of order by Gods inſtitution they were all one. But ſome ſtreyne it further, and take it, that Chriſt inſtituting thoſe two orders, did in ſo doing, inſtitute Biſhops and Preſbyters, the one wherof ſucceeded the Apoſtles, the other the 72, and that thus the Fathers take it. To which I anſwer, Firſt, in generall, this analogie of Apoſtles and 72, is not generally affected by them all. *Ignatius ad Smyrnenſes dicit Apoſtolis Preſbyteros ſucceſſiſſe, Diaconos 72, diſcipulis. Clem. lib. 2. Conſt. cap.* 30. ſaith, That Biſhops anſwer to God the Father, Preſbyters to Chriſt, Deacons to the Apoſtles. *Ierom* doth manifeſtly make Preſbyters (whom hee alſo calleth by name of Biſhops in that Epiſtle, where hee maintaineth the Preſbyters dignity) ſucceſſours to the Apoſtles. The like hath *Cyprian*, *Apoſtolos id eſt Epiſcopos & prepoſitos*, that is, *ordinis ratione prepoſitos minorum Eccleſiarum*, as *Auſtin* ſpeaketh, elſe it ſhould bee all one with the former: when hee maketh the Preſbyter as well as the Biſhop to be ordained in the Apoſtles. Finally, theſe Fathers who take the 72 to haue beene Apoſtles, as well as the other, could not imagine this proportion of diverſe orders ſet up in them. Secondly, if Chriſt in theſe inſtituted thoſe other, it muſt bee one of theſe waies. Firſt, hee did make theſe not onely Apoſtles, but Biſhops, and ſo the 72, not onely his meſſengers for the time, but Preſbyters alſo. Or, ſecondly, elſe hee did ordaine theſe as he did raine *Manna*, noting and prefiguring as by a type, a further thing which hee would worke: *viz.* that he would inſtitute Biſhops and Preſbyters for Teachers ordinary in his Church: but both theſe are *gatis* ſpoken, without any foundation or reaſon. For the firſt, we haue ſhewed that the Apoſtles could not bee Biſhops ordinarily; nor yet the calling of theſe ſeventie two (which was to goe through all Cities Evangelizing) ſtand with Preſbyters, Preſbyters being given to Churches κατ' ἐκλογήν, and there fixed. Neither can the latter be true: for

then Christ should haue giuen a Sacrament, when he ordained his Apostles, and sent forth his 72. Secondly, the type or the shadow is lesse then the thing typified, the substance of it. But the giving Apostles was a greater thing then giving ordinary Pastors. Ergo. Thirdly, I say, that Christ did never ordaine that any should succeed the Apostles, or the 72, in regard of their order. There is a double succession, *in gradum*, or *in Caput*, as the juristes distinguish. *In gradum eundem*, as when one brother dying, another brother doth succeed him in the inheritance. *In caput*, as when one not of the same degree and line doth come after another, as when a brother dying another doth inherite after him, not a brother, but a cosin to him. Thus the Apostles haue no successors succeeding them *in gradum*, but such onely as follow them, being of other degrees, and in another line, as it were, in which sort euery Pastor doth succeed them. But then they are said to succeed them, because they follow them, and after a sort resemble them, not because they hold the places which the Apostles did properly. *Apostolo in quantum est Apostolus non succeditur, Legato quatenus est Legatus non succeditur.* Fourthly, that the Presbyters doe as persons of a diverse order succeed the Apostles no lesse fully then any other. First, they must needs succeed them who are spoken to in them, whose duties are laid downe in that which the Apostles received in commandement. But the Presbyters were spoken to both in the Keyes, in the Supper, in the commandement of teaching and baptizing. Ergo, Presbyters must needs succeed the Apostles. Secondly, those whom the Apostles did institute in the Churches, which they had planted for their furrher building them up, they were their next successors. But the Apostles did commend the Churches to the care of Presbyters who might build them up, whom they had now converted. Ergo, these were their successors most proper and immediate. Thirdly, these to whom now taking their farewels they resigned the Churches, these were their successours. But this they did to Presbyters, *Paul* now never to see Ephesus more *Act.* 20, *Peter* neere death, 1. *Pet.* 5. 2. Ergo. Fourthly, if one Pastor or Minister doe more properly resemble an Apostle then another, it is because hee hath some power Apostolique more fully conveyed to him then to another. But this was not done. Ergo. The assumption is manifest: for. First, their power of teaching and ministring the Sacraments doth as fully and properly belong to the Presbyter as to any, unlesse we count Preaching not necessarily connexed to a Presbyters office, but a Bishops; or at least that a more rudimentall preaching belongs to a Presbyter, the more full and exact teaching being appropriate to the Bishop, which are both too absurd. Secondly, for government, the Apostles did no more giue the power of government to

one

one then to another. *Obj.* This is denyed, for the Apoſtles are ſaid to haue kept the power of ordination, and the coerciue power in their own hands, & to haue committed theſe in the end onely to Apoſtolique men, as *Timothy*, *Titus*, who were their ſucceſſors ſucceeding them in it. *Anſ.* A notable fiction: for it is moſt plain by Scripture; that ordination, power of deciding controverſies, excommunication, were given to Preſbyters, and not kept up from them; they ſhould otherwiſe haue provided ill for the Churches which they left to their care. Secondly, if the Apoſtles did commit ſome ordinary power of government to ſome men aboue others, in which regard they ſhould be their ſucceſſours, then the Apoſtles did not onely enjoy as *Legates* power over the Churches, but as ordinarie Miniſters. For what power they enjoyed as *Legates*, this they could not *aliis Legare*. Power as ordinary Paſtors in any Nations or Churches they never reſerved, and therefore did never ſubſtitute others to themſelues in that which they never exerciſed nor enjoyed. And it is to be noted, that this opinion of Epiſcopall ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles is grounded on this, that the Apoſtles were not onely Apoſtles, but Biſhops in Provinces and particular Churches. For the Papiſts themſelues urged with this, that the Apoſtles haue none ſucceeding them, they doe conſider a double reſpect in the Apoſtles, the one of *Legates*, ſo *Peter*, nor any other could haue a ſucceſſour, The other of Biſhops *Oecumenicall* in *Peter*, of Biſhops National or Dioceſan, as in ſome other. Thus onely conſidered, they grant them to haue other Biſhops ſucceeding them: For the Apoſtolick power preciſely conſidered, was *Privilegium perſonale ſimul cum perſona extinctum*. Now we haue proved that this ground is falſe, and therefore that ſucceding the Apoſtles, more appropriate to Biſhops then other Miniſters grounded upon it, is falſe alſo.

Laſtly, the Preſbyters cannot be ſaid ſucceſſors of the 72. For firſt, in all that is ſpoken to the 72, the full dutie and office of a Presbyter is not laid downe. Secondly, it doth not appeare that they had any ordinarie power of preaching or baptizing and miniſtering the other Sacrament. For they are ſent to Evangelize, to preach the Goſpell: but whether from power of ordinarie office, or from commiſſion and delegation onely for this preſent occaſion it is doubtful. Thirdly, it is not read that they ever baptized, or had the power of adminiſtring the Supper given to them: Yea, that they had neither miniſterie of Word or Sacraments *ex officio ordinario*, ſeemeth hence plaine; That the Apoſtles did chooſe them to the Deacons care, which was ſo cumberſome that themſelues could not tend the miniſtery of the Word with it, much leſſe then could theſe not having ſuch extraordinarie gifts as the Apoſtles had. Fourthly, if they were ſet Miniſters, then were they Euangeliſts in deſtination. For the act

enjoyned them, is from Citie to Citie, without limitation to Euangelize; and after we reade of some, as *Phillip*, that he was an Euangelist; the same is in Ecclesiasticall storie testified of some others. Thus we Presbyters should succeed Euangelists those Apostolique men whom the Apostles constituted Bishops, and by consequence be the true successours of the Apostles. These Euangelists succeeded them by all grant, we succeed these. Finally, *Armachanus* doth take these 72 to haue been ordinary disciples, in his 7 *Book Armenicarum quæst. cap.* 7.

11 *Argument.*

Those who receiue a new ordination are in a higher degree in a new administration and a new order. But Bishops doe so. Ergo.

Answer.

The proposition is denyed: for it is sufficient to a new ordination that they are called to exercise the Pastorall function in a new Church where before they had nothing to doe. Secondly, I answer by distinction, a new order, by reason of new degrees of dignity, this may be granted: but that therefore it is a new order, that is, having further ministeriall power in regard of the Sacraments and jurisdiction given it of God, is not true. Hath not an Archbishop a distinct ordination or consecration from a Bishop? yet is hee not of any order essentially differing. The truth is, ordination, if it be looked into, is but a canonicall solemnity which doth not collate that power Episcopall to the now chosen, but onely more solemnly and orderly promotes him to the exercise of it.

12 *Argument.*

Those Ministers whereof there may bee but one onely during life in a Church, they are in sigularity of preheminence aboue others. But there may be but one Bishop, though there may be many other Presbyters, one *Timothie*, one *Titus*, one *Archippus*, one *Epaphroditus*. Ergo. For proofe of the assumption. See *Cornelius*, as *Eusebius* relateth his sentence, *lib.* 6. *cap.* 43. *Conc. Nice. cap.* 8. *Conc. Calced. cap.* 4. *Possidonius in vita Augustine. Ierom. Phil.* 1. *ver.* 1, *Chrysost. Amb. Theod. Oecumen.* And such was Bishops preheminence, that Presbyters, Deacons, and other Clerkes, are said to bee the Bishops Clerks.

Answer.

I answer to the Assumption. That there may be said to bee but one Bishop in order to other Coadjutors and Associates with in the same Church. It may be said, there must be but one Bishop in order to all the other Churches of the Cities. Secondly, this may be affirmed as standing by Canon, or as diuine institution. Now the assumption is true, onely by Law Ecclesiasticall. For the Scripture is said to haue placed Presbyters who did *Superintendere*, *Act.* 20. and

that

that there were Biſhops at *Philippi*. True it is, the Scripture doth not diſtinguiſh how manie of the one ſort, nor how many of the other, becauſe nō doubt for the number of the Congregations, a ſingle Preſbyter labouring in the Word, or two, the one coadjutor to the other might be placed. Secondly, it is teſtified by *Epiphanius*, that ordinarilie all Cities but *Alexandria* had two. Thirdly, *Ierom* on 1. *Tim.* 3. doth ſaie, that now indeed there may be but one Biſhop, meaning Canonicallie, making a difference twixt the preſent time and time Apoſtolique. Fourthlie, *Auſtin*, did not kuow it was unlawfull: Yea he did onelie in regard of the decree of Nice account it ſo. *Ep.* 110. neither did Church or people ever except againſt the contrary, but as a point againſt Canon, which might in ſome caſes be diſpenſed with, as the ſtorie of *Narciſſus*, and *Alexander*, and *Liberius*, and *Fœlix* doth more then manifeſt. For though the people of Rome cried out one God, one Chriſt, one Biſhop, yet they yeelded at their Emperours ſuite, wheras had it been a thing they had all thought to haue been againſt Chriſts inſtitution, they would not haue done. *Vide Soz. lib.* 4. *cap.* 14. Fiftly, *Ieroms* peereleſſe power, is nothing but Conſul-like preſidence aboue others; for this he pleaded for, writing againſt *Iouinian lib.* 1. amongſt the Apoſtles themſelues, that ſchiſme might be avoided. Wherfore we yeeld the concluſion in this ſenſe, that the Biſhop *Iure humano*, hath a ſingularity of preheminence before others, as by Eccleſiaſticall law there might be but one onely Archbiſhop.

13 *Argument.*

Thoſe who had peereleſſe power aboue others in ordination and juriſdiction, they were ſuch as had preheminence and majority of rule over others. But the former is due to Biſhops. Vnleſſe this ſingularitie of power were yeelded, there would be as many ſchiſmes as Prieſts. Ergo. The aſſumption proved. *Thoſe who haue a peculiar power of ordination aboue others, they are in preheminence and power before others. But Biſhops haue, Ergo*, they are in &c. The aſſumption proved. That which was not in the Preſbyters of *Epheſus* and *Crete* before *Timothy* and *Titus* were ſent, but in the Apoſtles, and after in *Timothy* and *Titus* and their ſucceſſours, that is a peculiar of Biſhops. But ordination was not in the Preſbyters, &c. Ergo. The aſſumption proved. That which theſe were ſent to doe, Preſbyters had not power to doe. It was therefore in them, and ſuch as ſucceeded them, the Biſhops of Epheſus and Crete. Againe, the Scriptures, Councels, Fathers, ſpeake of the ordeyner as one. Ergo, it was the peculiar right of the Biſhop, and the Biſhop onely. Hee onely by Canon was puniſhable for irregularitie in ordination. And *Epiphanius* maketh this the proper power of a Biſhop to beget fathers by ordination, as the

Presbyters doth sonnes by Baptisme. And *Ierom* doth except ordination as the Bishops peculiar, wherein hee is most unequall to them.

Answer.

I answer the Proposition of the first Sillogisme by distinction. Those who haue peereleſſe power in regard of the simple right to ordeine; viz. in regard of exercising the act, and sole performing the rite of it, those who haue a right to these things originally from Christ and his Apostles which no others haue, they are aboue others in degree. Againe, peereleſſe power in a Bishop over Presbyters may be said in comparison to them distributiuely or collectiuely considered. Hee that hath peereleſſe power given him which no one of the other hath, is not presently of a greater degree, nor hath not majoritie of rule amongst others, as a Consul in the Senate: But if he haue a peereleſſe power, such as they all collectiuely considered, cannot controule, then the Proposition is true; but the Assumption will then be found to halt.

To the proofe of the assumption. The Proposition is true of power in order to the thing it selfe, not to ministring the rite, and executing the act, which may be reserved for honour sake to one; by those who otherwise haue equall power with him. That Bishops haue this power in order, the thing it selfe agreeing to them, *Vi proprii officii*, not by commission from others, we deny. The assumption is wholly denyed. As for the proofe of it. First, we that deny that Euangelists had not power to ordeyne, as well as Apostles. Secondly, that Presbyters had not this power in a Church planted as well as they. Euery one as fellow servants might conspire in the same ordination. The Euangelists power did not derogate from the Apostles, the Presbyters from neither of them. But power of imposing hands solitarily, whereas yet Churches were not constituted, this may happily be appropriated to the Apostles and Euangelists, whose office it was to labour in erecting the frame of churches. Secondly, the assumption is false; in denying that it was in the power of Presbyters to lay on hands, contrarie to that in *Timothie*; *The grace given thee by laying on of the hands of the Presbytery*. Thirdly, it is false, in presupposing others then Presbyters to haue been *Timothy* and *Titus* their successors. To the proofe of this assumption. The proposition is not true: For it might be convenient that the same thing should be done by Euangelists, and by ordinary Pastors, each concurring in their severall orders to the same service of Christ the Lord. Secondly, I answer to the assumption. That Presbyters were to bee placed in Churches framed where there were Presbyters, or where there were as yet none. In the

first

setle Churches, they are bid ordaine if any need further, but *salvo jure Ecclesiæ*, not without the concurrence of others. In the latter Churches which were to be constituted, they may be conceived as Evangelists, with sole power of setting Presbyters forth by this rite of imposition of hands. Wee hold Apostles might doe it, Evangelists might, and the Presbyteries also. Yea Presbyters in Alexandria when now their first Presbyter was deceased, did ordaine the following: For the Canon of three Bishops, and Metropolitans, added by the Nicene Councell, was not knowne yet. Nevertheless it grew timely to be restrained to Bishops, the performing I meane of the outward rite and signe; but onely by Canon, as Consignation was also, for which there is as ancient testimonies as this, that it was appropriat to the Bish. We grant therfore that antiquitie doth sometime speak of the ordainer as one. In the Churches of Affrica one did not lay on hands, yet in some other churches the rite was by one administred. And it is to be noted by the way, that εἷς ἐπίσκοπος in some Canons is not opposed to the Coordaining of Presbyters, but to the number of *Three*, or many Bishops required in the ordination of a Bishop. They might therfore by their canons be punishable, because regularly and canonically the executing of it was committed to thē. This is all that *Epiphanius* or *Ieroms excepta ordinatione* can prove. But these two conclusions we would see proved out of Scriptures and Fathers. First, that ordination is an action of power of order, a power sacramental, which a Presbyter hath not. Secondly, that by vertue of this power, the Bishop doth ordaine, and not by Ecclesiasticall right or commission from the Church. Certainlie, the act of promoting a minister of the Church, is rather an act of iurisdiction then order. As it belongeth to policie and government, to call new Magistrates, where they are wanting. *Obiect.* But a new spirituall officer may be instituted by a sacrament. *Answ.* If God would so have collated the grace of spirituall callings; but hee hath appointed no such thing. The Apostles and 72. were not instituted by a sacrament or imposition of Christs hands. Now the greater the grace was which was given, the more need of a sacrament whereby it should bee given. *Obiect.* They were extraordinarie. *Answ.* They might have had some ambulatorie sacrament for the time. Againe, imposition of hands was used in giving extraordinary graces, Act. 8. Secondly, were it a sacrament, it should conferre the grace of office, as well as grace sanctifying the person to use it holily. But we see that this it could not do As for *Paul* and *Barnabas* the Church did separate them at the command of God, and lay hands on them, and pray for them, but they were alreadie before this, immediatlie chosen by God to the grace of their office. It could be nothing then but a a gesture accompanied with praier, seeking

grace

grace in their behalfe. For the sacramentall collating of grace sanctifying all callings, we have in these two sacraments of Christs institution. Thirdly, there are many kindes of imposition of hands in the old and new testament, yet cannot it be proved, that it is any where a proper sacrament. It is then a rite, a gesture, a ceremony, signifying a thing or person separate, presented to God, praied for to God. Thus Antiquitie did think of it, as a gesture of one, by praier to God, seeking a blessing on every one chosen to this or that place of ministery. So Ecclesiasticallie it was used in baptising, in consecrating, in reconciling penetents, as well as ordaining: but never granted as a sacrament in those other cases by grant of all. It is then a rite or gesture of one, praying, *Tertul. de bapt.* sheweth this, saying, *Manus imponitur per benedictionem advocans & invitans spiritum sanctum. Ierom* also *contra Luciferanos, Non abnuo, hanc esse Ecclesiæ consuetudinem ut Episcopus manum impositurus excurrat ad invocationem spiritus sancti. Amb. de dignit. sacerdot. Sacerdos imponit supplicem dextram. August. Quid aliud est manus impositio quam oratio. &c.* The Greeke Churches haue ever given Orders by a forme of praier conceived with imposition of hands. Hence it is, that they imposed hands even on Deaconesses, where it could not bee otherwise considered then a deprecative gesture. Neither is it like the African Fathers ever thought it a sacrament, which no other had vertue and power to minister, but the Bishop. For then they would never haue admitted Presbyters to use the same rite with them. For so they had suffered them to prophane a sacrament, wherein they had no power to intermeddle. *Obiect.* If one say they did lay on hands with them, but the Bishops imposition was properlie *Consecrative* and sacramentall, theirs *Deprecative* onelie. *Answer.* Besides that this is spoken without foundation, how absurd is it, that the verie selfesame sacramentall rite should bee a sacrament in one ministers hand, and no sacrament performed by another: Yea, when the Bishop doth it to a Presbyter, or Deacon, then a sacrament; when to a Subdeacon, and other inferiour officers, then none, let any iudge. *Austin* did account no other of imposition of hands, then a praier over a man, accompanied with that gesture. Secondlie, they doe not thinke that the Bishop ordaineth by divine right, it being excepted to him as a minister of higher sacramentall power: but that he onelie doth ordain *quoad signum & ritum extrinsecum*, by the Churches commission, though the right of ordaining bee in all the Presbyterie also. As in a Colledge the societie have right to choose a fellow, and to ordain him also, though the master doth alone lay on hands, and give admission. Thus *Ierom* speaketh of confirmation, that it was reserved to the Bishop for honour sake,

rather

rather then any neceſſitie of Gods law. Whence by analogie and proportion, it followeth they think not ordination, or thoſe other Epiſcopall roialties to have been reſerved to him by divine right. Beſide there are more ancient proofes for Canonicall appropriating confirmation, then for this impoſition of hands. *Cornelius* ſpeaketh thus of *Novatus*, hee wanted thoſe things which hee ſhould have had after Baptiſme, according to the Canon, the ſealing of our Lord from a Biſhop, *Euſeb. Lib. 6. cap. 25.* So *Cyprian* to *Iul.* Nevertheleſſe *Ierom* iudgeth this alſo to have been yeelded them for honour ſake. And wee know that in the Biſhops abſence, Preſbyters through the Eaſt did *Conſignare*, through Grecia, through Armenia. Neither would *Gregorie* the great haue allowed Preſbyters in the Greek Churches to have confirmed, had hee iudged it otherwiſe then Canonicallie to belong to the Biſhops. That therefore which is not properly a ſacramentall action, and that which is not appropriate to a Biſhop further then Preſbyters have committed it to him, that cannot make him in higher degree of miniſterie then Preſbyters are.

Thirdly, in reconciling penitents, the Preſbyters did it in caſe of the Biſhops abſence: as is to bee gathered from the third Councell of Carthage, 32. And who thinkes bleſſing ſo appropriate to a Biſhop, that Preſbyters may not ſolemnlie bleſſe in the name of the Lord, though antiquitie reſerved this to him. Theſe therefore were kept to him, not as actes exceeding the Presbyters power of order, but for the ſuppoſed honor of him & the Church. For as *Ambroſe* ſayth, *Vt omnes eadem poſſent irrationale, & vulgaris res, viliſq; videretur.* It pleaſeth antiquitie therefore to ſet up one who ſhould *quoad exercitium* doe manie things alone, not becauſe that Presbyters could not, but it ſeemed in their eyes more to the honour of the Church, that ſome one ſhould be intereſſed in them.

Fourthlie, *Amalarius* in a certaine booke ſacred orders, doth confute the doctrine of an uncertain authour, who taught that one Biſhop onelie was to lay hands on a Deacon becauſe he was conſecrated not to Prieſthood, but to miniſterie and ſervice. *Nunquid ſcriptor libelli doctior & ſanctior Apoſtolis qui poſuerunt plures manus ſuper Diaconos quando conſecrabantur, & propterea ſolus Epiſcopus manus ponat ſuper Diaconum ac ſi ſolus poſſit precari virtutem gratiarum quam plures Apoſtoli precabantur. Optimũ eſt bonos duces ſequi, qui certaverunt uſq; ad plenam victoriam.* Whence it is plaine, hee did know no further thing in impoſition then praier, which the more impoſe, is the more forcible.

The fourteenth Argument.

Thoſe who had juriſdiction over Preſbyters aſſiſting them, and Preſbyters affixed to Cures, they had a ſuperioritie of power over other miniſters. But Biſhops had ſo, Ergo, &c.

The

The Assumption is manifest, *Ignatius* describeth the Bishop from this, that he should be the governour of the Presbyterie and whole Church, ὡς θεοῦ ἄρχειν. And *Ierom* and *Austin* on the 44 Psal: call them the Princes of the Church, by whom shee is governed. The assumption is proved particularly. Those who had directive power aboue others, and corrective, they had majoritie of rule. But Bishops had. Ergo. The assumption proved. First, for directive power, the Presbyters were to doe nothing without them. *Igna. ad Mag. ad Smyr.* They might not minister the sacrament of the supper but under the Bishop, *Clem. Epist. 1. ad Iacob. Tert. Lib. de bapt. Can. Apost. 38. Con. Carthag. 4. 38. Con. Car. 2. Can. 9. Con. Gan. 16. Conc. Ant. Can. 5.*

Secondly, that they had corrective power, it is proved, *Apoc. 2. & 3.* The Angel of *Ephesus* did not suffer false Apostles, & is commended for it, the Angel of *Thyatira* is reproved for suffering the like. Therfore they had power over other ministers. Cyp. lib. 3. Ep. 9. telleth telleth *Rogatian* he had power to haue censured his Deacon. *Ierom. adversus Vigilantium*, marvelleth that the Bishop where *Vigilantius* was, did not breake the unprofitable vessell. *Epiphanius* sayth, Bishops governed the Presbyters themselves, they the people. The Presbyters affixed to places & churches, were subject to the Bishops, for when they were vacant, the Bishop did supplie them. Againe, the Presbyters had their power from him, and therefore were under him, and they were subiect to the censure of the Bishop. Those of his Clergie were under him; for hee might promote them, they might not goe from one Dioceese to another without him, not travell to the Citie, but by his leave. The Bishop was their iudge, and might excommunicate them, Cypr. lib. 1. Epist. 3. Concil. Carth. 4. ca. 59. Conc. Chal. ca 9. Conc. Nice, ca. 4. Conc. Ant. ca. 4. ibid. ca. 6. ca. 12. Cart. 2. cap. 7. Conc. Afric. ca. 29. Conc. Ephes. ca. 5. Con. Chal. ca. 23. The examples of *Alexander* and *Chrysostome* prove this. All Presbyters were counted *acephali*, headlesse, that lived not in subiection to a Bishop. The Pastors of parishes were either subject to Bishops, or they had associats in Parishes ioyned with them, or they ruled alone. But they had not associats, neither did they rule alone. Ergo, they were subject to the authoritie and jurisdiction of the Bishop.

Answer.

The proposition of the first Syllogisme it must bee thus framed. Those who had power of iurisdiction in themselves, without the concurrence of other Presbyters, as fellow judges, they were greater in maioritie of rule. Thus Bishops had not iurisdiction. True it is, they were called governours and Princes of their Churches, because they were more eminent ministers, though they had

not

not Monarchicall power in Churches, but Conſull-like authoritie: and therefore when they affected this Monarchie, what ſayd *Ierom*, *Noverint ſe ſacerdotes eſſe non dominos, noverint ſe non ad Principatum vocatos, ſed ad ſervitium totius Eccleſiæ.* Sic Origen in Eſa. hom. 7.

To the proofe of the Aſſumption. Wee deny that they had this directive power over all Preſbyters. Secondly, that they had it over any by humane conſtitution infallible. Presbyters were in great difference. Thoſe who are called *proprij ſacerdotes*, *Rectores*, *Seniores*, *Minorum Eccleſiarum præpoſiti*, the Biſhop had not, nor challenged not that directive power over them, which hee did over thoſe who were numbred amongſt his Clerickes, who were helpes to him in the Liturgie, in Chappells and pariſhes which did depend on him as their proper teacher, though they could not ſo ordinarilie goe out to him. The firſt had power within their Churches, to teach, adminiſter, excommunicate, were counted brethren to the Biſhops, and called *Epiſcopi*, or *Coepiſcopi*, even of the Auncient: But the Presbyters, which were part of their Clergie, they had this directiue power over them, the Canons Eccleſiaſticall allowing the ſame. But I take theſe latter to have been but a corruption of governing presbyters, who came to bee made a humane miniſtery, 1. by having ſingular actes permitted. 2. by being conſecrate to this, & ſo doing *ex officio*, what they were imploied in by the Biſhop. But ſure theſe are but helps to liturgie, according to the Canons. Preaching did not agree to them further then it could be delegated or permitted. Finally, we read, that by law it was permitted them: that it was taken away from them again by the Biſhops: that it was ſtinted and limited ſometime as to the opening of the Lords praier, the Creed and 10 commandements: as it is plain to him that is any thing converſant in the ancient. Secondlie, let us account them as miniſters of the word, given by God to his church: then I ſay, they could not have any direction, but ſuch as the Apoſtles had amongſt Evangeliſts: and this power is given to the Biſhops onelie by canon ſwerving from the firſt ordinance of Chriſt: for it maketh a miniſter of the word become as a cypher, without power of his conſecration, as *Ierom* ſpeaketh, being ſo interpreted by *Bilſon* himſelf. Theſe decrees were as juſtifiable, as that which forbiddeth any to baptiſe, who hath not gotten chriſme from the Biſhop *Con. Carth. 4. ca.* 36. unleſſe the phraſes doe note onelie a precedence of order in the Biſhop aboue presbyters, requiring preſence and aſſent, as of a fellow and chiefe member, not otherwiſe.

To the proof of the ſecond part of the former aſſumption, 1. we denie this majoritie of corrective power to have been in the Apoſtles themſelves: they had only a miniſtry executiue inflicting that which

Christs correctiue power imposed. Secondly, we deny that this ministeriall power of censuring was singularly exercised by any Apostle or Evangliſt, where Churches were constituted. Neither is the writing to one aboue others, an argument that he had the power to doe all alone without concurrence of others. To that of *Cyprian* against *Rogatian*, we deny that *Cyprian* meaneth he would haue done it alone, or that he and his Presbyterie could have done it without the consent of Bishops neighbouring: but that he might in regular manner have been bold to have done it, because he might be sure, *quod nos collegæ tui omnes id ratum haberemus*. *Cyprian* was of iudgement, that he himself might do nothing without the consent of his Presbyters, unlesse he should violate his dutie, by running a course which stood not with the honour of his brethren. It was not modestie in him; but due obseruancie, such as he did owe unto his brethren. Neither did *Cyprian* ever ordinarilie any thing alone. He received some, the people and the brethren contradicting, *lib.* 1. *ep.* 3. but not till he had perswaded them, and brought them to be willing. *Thou seest* (saith he) *what pains I have to perswade the brethren to patience*. So againe, *I hardly perswade the people, yea even bring it frō them, that such should be received*. Neither did he take upon him to ordaine Presbyters alone: but propounded, made request for them, confessing, that further then God did extraordinarilie prevent both him and them, they had the right of suffrage, no lesse then himselfe, as by these epistles may appeare, *l.* 1. *ep.* 20. *l.* 2. *ep.* 5. *l.* 4. *ep.* 10. *Ierom* (though grandiloquent sometimes) did never thinke a Bishop could lawfully without his Presbyteries concurrence, excommunicate. If he were as *Moses*, yet hee would haue these as the seventie. Againe, *Ierom* doth write expreslie of all in generall, *Et nos senatum habemus, cœtum Presbyterorum, sine quorum consilio nihil agi à quoquam licet, sicut Romani habuerunt senatum cujus consilio cuncta gerebantur*. *Epiphanius* saith, Bishops governed Presbyters: but it doth not follow, that therfore they did it alone without concurrence of their com-Presbyters. As for the fixed Presbyters, the proofes are more unsufficient. The Bishop supplyed them, therefore they were under him. For colleges supply Churches, yet haue they no jurisdiction over them. Secondly, the canons did ptovide *ne plebi invitæ Presbyter obtruderetur*. Thirdly, we distinguish majoritie of rule from some jurisdiction. We grant the Bishop had such a jurisdiction as concerned the Church, so farre as it was in societie with others, such as an Arch-bishop hath over a Province: but this did stand with the Rectors power of jurisdiction within his own Church. Fourthly, though they had power by his ministeriall interposition, yet this doth not proue them dependant on him. For Bishops haue their power from others ordaining them, to whom notwithstanding they are not subject

ject in their Churches. In caſe of delinquencie they were ſubject to the Biſhop with the Preſbyterie, yet ſo that they could not be proceeded againſt till conſent of many other Biſhops did ratifie the ſentence. Thus in *Cyprians* judgement, Biſhops themſelves delinquent, tnrning wolves, as *Samoſatenus*, *Liberius*, &c. are ſubiect to their Churches & Presbyters, to be depoſed and relinquiſhed by them. As for thoſe that were part of his Clerks, it is true, they were in greater meaſure ſubject to him, abſolutely in a manner for their direction: but for his corrective power hee could not without conſent of his Presbyters and fellow Biſhops, do any thing. The Biſhop indeed is onely named many times: but it is a common Synecdoche, familiar to the fathers, who put the primarie member of the Church for the repreſentative Church, as *Auguſtine* ſayth, *Petrum propter Apoſtolatus ſimplicitatem figuram Eccleſiæ geſſiſſe.* See concil. Sardicen. c. 17. conc. Carth. 4. c. 2. 3. Tol. 4. c. 4. Socr. l. 1. 3. Soz. l. 1. c. 14. As for ſuch examples as *Alexanders*, it is ſtrange that any will bring it, when hee did it not without a Synod of many Biſhops, yea without his Clergie, as ſitting in judgement with him. *Chryſoſtoms* fact fact is not to be iuſtified: for it was altogether irregular, ſavouring of the impetuous nature to which is he was inclined, though in regard of his end, and unworthineſſe of his Presbyters, it may be excuſed, yet it is not to be imitated. As for thoſe headleſſe Clerkes, it maketh nothing for the Biſhops maioritie of rule over all Churches and Preſbyters in them. For firſt, it ſeemeth to be ſpoken of thoſe that lived under the conduct of the Biſhop, a collegiat life together, *Eodem refectorio & dormitorio utebantur, & Canonicè viventes ab Epiſcopo inſtruebantur.* Now when all ſuch Clerkes did live then as members of a Colledge under a maiſter, it is no wonder if they bee called headleſſe, who did belong to no Biſhop. Secondly, ſay it were alike of all Presbyters, which will never be proved (for all Preſbyters in the Dioceſſe were not belonging to the Biſhops Clerks) ſay it were, yet will it not follow, that thoſe who were under ſome, were ſubject to his authoritie of rule. For there is a head in regard of preſidencie of order, as well as of power. Biſhops were to finde out by Canon the chiefe Biſhop of their province, and to aſſociate themſelves with him. So Biſhops doe now live ranged under their Archbiſhops as heads. Prieſts therefore as well as Clerkes, did live under ſome iuriſdiction of the Biſhops: but ſuch as did permit them coercive power in their owne Churches, ſuch as made the Biſhop a head in regard of dignitie, and not of any power, vvhereby he might ſway all at his pleaſure. Thirdlie, if the Biſhops degenerate to challenge Monarchie or tyrannie, it is better bee without ſuch heads then to have them: as we are more happie in being withdrawen from the headſhip of the Biſhop of Rome, then if he ſtill were head over us.

To the laſt inſinuation, proving that Biſhops had the government of thoſe Churches which presbyters had, becauſe neither preſbyters alone had it, nor with aſſiſtents. I anſwer, they had as well the power of government, as of teaching: and though they had not ſuch aſſiſtants as are the presbyters of a cathedral church, yet they might have ſome, as a deacon, or other perſon ſufficient in ſuch ſmall Churches. When the Apoſtles planted a Biſhop and Deacon onely, how did this Biſhop excommunicate? When the fathers of Africa did give a Biſhop unto thoſe now multiplied, who had enioyed but a Presbyter, what aſſiſtants did they give him? what aſſiſtants had the *Chorepiſcopi*, who yet had government of their churches?

The fifteenth Argument.

That which the orthodoxe churches ever condemned as hereſie, the contrarie of that is truth. But in *Aerius* they have condemned the deniall of ſuperioritie in one miniſter above others. Ergo, the contrarie is truth.

Anſwer.

To the propoſition, we denie that it muſt needs be preſently true, the contrarie wherof is generallie condemned for hereſie. As the repreſentative catholick church may propound an errour, ſo ſhe may condemne a particular truth, and yet remain a catholick church. To the aſſumption we deny that the Church condemned in *Aerius* every deniall of ſuperioritie, but that onely which *Aerius* run into. Now his opinion I take to have been this. 1. He did with *Ierom* denie ſuperioritie of anie kind as due by Chriſts ordinance: for this opinion was never counted hereſie, it was *Ieroms* plainlie. 2. He did not denie the fact, that Biſhops were ſuperiour in their actuall adminiſtration; he could not be ſo mad. If he had all that a Biſhop had actuallie, how could he have affected to be a Biſhop, as a further honour? Denial of ſuperioritie, ſuch as conſiſteth in a further power of order then a Presbyter hath, and in a kinglie monarchical majoritie of rule, this deniall is not here condemned: for all the fathers may be broughs as witneſſes againſt this ſuperioritie in the Church. What then was condemned in him? A denial of all ſuperioritie in one miniſter before another, though it were but of honor and dignitie: and ſecondlie the denying of this in ſchiſmaticall manner, ſo as to forſake communion with the Church wherin it is. For in theſe words, μηδὲν εἶναι διαφορώτερον ἐπίσκοπον τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ, it ſeemeth μηδὲν ſhould be read μὴ δεῖν, that there ought to be none. Howſoever he is to be conceived as appoſing practicallie the difference of honour & dignitie which was in the Church by Eccleſiaſtical inſtitution. What is this to us? Denial of ſuperioritie ia regard of honor & dignitie, joined with ſchiſme, was condemned: Ergo, deniall of ſuperioritie in power of order and kinglie majoritie of rule, keeping the bond of loue was condemned.

The aſſumption therefore if it aſſume not of this laſt deniall, then can it not conclude againſt us. Ergo, it is a truth that ſome Miniſters may be aboue otherſome, in order, honor, and dignity. But they underſtand not by order ſuch an order onely as is diſtinct, becauſe ſome degree of dignitie is appropriate to it, which is not to other. Though this argument therefore touch us not, yet to ſpeake a little further about it, this opinion of *Aerius* is not to be handled too ſeverely: neither our authors, D. *Whitakerus*, D. *Reinolds*, *Danæus*, to be blamed, who doe in ſome ſort excuſe him. For Biſhops were grown ſuch that many good perſons were offended at them, as the *Audiani*. Yea, it was ſo ordinarie, that *Ieroue* diſtinguiſheth ſchiſme from hereſie, becauſe the one conteined aſſertions againſt the faith, the other ſevered from the Church by reaſon of diſſenting from Biſhops. See him on *Tit.* 3. 10. Neither is it plain that he was an Arrian. *Epiphanius* reporteth it, but no other, though writing of this ſubject and ſtorie of theſe times. Sure it is, *Euſtathius* was a ſtrong Arian, whom *Aerius* did oppoſe. Neither is it ſtrange for Biſhops to faſten on thoſe which diſſent from them in this point of their freehold, any thing whereof there is but ungrounded ſuſpicion. Are not we traduced as Donatiſts, Anabaptiſts, Puritanes? As for his opinion, they thought it rather ſchiſmatical, then hereticall: & therfore happily called it hereſie, becauſe it included errour in their underſtanding, which with ſchiſmaticall pertinacie was made hereſie. Neither is it likely that *Epiphanius* doth otherwiſe count it hereſie, nor *Auſtin* following him. For though *Auſtine* was aged, yet he was ſo humble, that hee ſaith, *Auguſtinus ſenex à puero nondum amiculo paratus ſum edoceri*. Neither was it prejudice to his worth for to follow men more ancient then himſelfe, who in likelyhood ſhould know this matter alſo better. As for his calling it hereſie, it is certaine he would not haue this in rigour ſtreined. For he doth proteſt (in his preface unto that book of hereſies) that none to his thought, can in a regular definition comprehend what that is which maketh this or that to be hereſie. Though therefore he doubted not of this, that *Aerius* was in errour, ſuch as all Catholickes ſhould decline: yet it doth not argue that he thought this errour in rigour and formall propriety, to haue been hereſie. Thus much for this laſt Argument.

On the contrarie ſide I propound theſe Arguments following to be ſeriouſly conſidered.

Argument 1.

Thoſe whom the Apoſtles placed as chiefe, in their firſt conſtituting of Churches, and left as their ſucceſſours in their laſt farewels which they gaue to the Churches, they had none ſuperiour to them in the Churches. But they firſt placed Preſbyters, feeding

with the Word and governing: and to those in their last departings they commended the Churches. Ergo. The assumption is denied: they did not place them, as the chiefe ordinary Pastors in those Churches, but placed them to teach and governe, *in foro interno*; with a reference of subordination to a more eminent Pastor, which when now they were growen to a just multitude should be given to them. The Apostles had all power of order and jurisdiction: they gaue to Presbyters power of order, power to teach, minister sacraments, and so gather together a great number of those who were yet to be converted; but kept the coerciue power in their own hands, meaning, when now by the Presbyters labour, the Churches were grown to a greater multitude, meaning (I say) then to set over them some more eminent Pastors, Apostolicall men, to whom they would commit the power of government, that so they might rule over both the Presbyters and their Churches; and to these with their successours, not to the Presbyters, were the Churches recommended. All which is an audacious fiction, without any warrant of Scripture, or shew of good reason. For it is confessed, that Presbyters were placed at the first constitution, as the Pastors and Teachers of the Churches. Now if the Apostles had done this with reference to a further and more eminent Pastor and Governour they would haue intimated somewhere this their intention: but this they doe not; yea, the contrary purpose is by them declared. For *Peter* so biddeth his Presbyters feed their flocks, as that he doth insinuate them subject to no other but Christ, the Arch-shepheard of them all. Againe, the Apostles could not make the Presbyters Pastors without power of government. There may be governours without pastorall power; but not a Pastor without power of governing. For the power of the *Pedum*, or shepheards staffe, doth intrinsecally follow the Pastorall office. What likelyhood is there, that those who were set as parents to beget children should not be trusted with power of the rod wherewith children now begotten are to be nurtured and kept in awe beseeming them? If it be said, every one fit for the office of a Teacher, was not fit for a Governour. I answer, hee that is fit to be a Pastor teaching and governing *in foro interno*, is much more fit to be a Governour externally: hee who is fit for the greater is fit for the lesser. It was a greater and more Apostolicall worke to labour conversion, and bring the Churches a handfull in the planting (as some thinke) to become numbersome in people, then it is to govern them being converted. And it is absurd to think that those who were fit to gather a Church, and bring it to fulnesse from small beginnings, should not be fit to governe it, but stand in need to haue some one sent, who might rule them and the Churches they had collected. Seconaly, these Presbyters were (as themselues

themſelues confeſſe) qualified with the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, and choſen by ſpeciall deſignation: ſo that to impute inſufficiencie unto them, is harſh, and injurious to God, as well as to man. Finally, by the twentie of the Acts, and the firſt Epiſtle of *Peter*, ch. 5. it is plaine, they doe in their laſt farewels commit the Churches unto the Preſbyters, not ſuggeſting any thing of a further Paſtor to bee ſent, who ſhould ſupply their roomes: which yet they would not haue forgotten, being a thing of ſo great conſolation, had it been intended by them.

Argument. 2.

Thoſe who haue the name and office of Biſhops common to them, they haue no ſuperiour Paſtors over them. But the Preſbyters Paſtorall haue that name and office attributed to them. For firſt they are ſayd to governe in generall. Secondly, there is nothing found belonging to the power of the keyes *in foro externo*, but the Scripture doth aſcribe it to them, power of ſuffrage in councell, *Act.* 15. power of excommunication, which is manifeſt to haue been in the Church of Corinth when it had no Biſhop, power of ordination, 1. *Tim.* 4. If any ſay, that this their power was but by commiſſion in them, and that they were ſubordinate to the Apoſtles in exercíſe of it, being to reteine it onely untill ſuch time as more eminent Paſtors ſhould be given: I anſwer, all this is ſpoken *gratis*, without any foundation, and therefore no more eaſily vouched then rejected. The Presbyters ſo had this power, that they did commit it to the Biſhops, as we ſhall ſhew after: and therefore it muſt haue been in them, not by extraordinary commiſſion, but by ordinarie office. Secondly, they were ſubject in exercíſe to none but Chriſt and the Holy Ghoſt, who onely had out of authoritie truſted them with it. If the Apoſtles and they did concurre in doing one and the ſame thing, they did it as inferiour to the Apoſtles, and ſervants of a lower order, not with any ſubjection to them, as heads of derivation, ſerving Chriſt their onely Lord, no leſſe immediately then the Apoſtles themſelues.

Argument. 3.

That which is found in all other orders of Miniſters inſtituted by Chriſt, may be preſumed likewiſe in the order of Paſtors and Doctors: but in all other orders, there were none that had ſingularity of preheminence and majority of power aboue other. No Apoſtle, Propher, Euangeliſt had this rule one over another. If the propoſition bee denyed, upon ſuppoſall of a different reaſon, becauſe that though paritie in a few extraordinarie Miniſters might bee admitted without diſorder, yet in a multitude of ordinarie Miniſters, it could not but breed ſchiſme and confuſion, and therfore as the order of Prieſthood was divided into

a high

a high Priest, and other secondary ones, so is it fit that the Presbyters of the new Testament should be divided, some being in the first, and some in the second ranke. To this I answer, the paritie is the more dangerous, by how much the places are supereminent. Secondly, though Pastors should be equall, yet this would not bring parity into the Ministers of the Church, some whereof should be in degree inferiour to other, the governing Elders to the Pastors, and the Deacons to them. Thirdly, if every Church being an Ecclesiasticall body, should haue governours every way equall, there were no feare of confusion, seeing Aristocracie, especially where God ordaineth it, is a forme of government sufficient to preserue order. But every Church might then doe what ever it would within it selfe. Not so neither; for it is subject to the censure of other Churches synodically assembled, and to the civill Magistrate, who in case of delinquencie, hath directiue and correctiue power over it. Parity doth not so much indanger the Church by schisme, as imparity doth by tyrannie subject it. As for the distinction of Priests, we grant it; but as man could not haue made that distinction, had not God ordained it in time of the old Testament, no more can we under the new. Howbeit, that distinction of Priests did bring in no such difference in order and majority of rule, as our Bishops now challenge.

Argument. 4.

If some be inferiour unto othersome in degree of power, it must be in regard of their power to teach, or their power to govern, or in the application of this power to their persons, or in regard of the people whom they teach and governe, or finally, in regard the exercise of their power is at the direction of another. But no Pastor or Teacher dependeth on any other but Christ for any of these. Ergo. The proposition standeth on a sufficient enumeration: the assumption may be proved in the severall parts of it. The former branch is thus cleared. First, the power we haue, is the same essentially with theirs; yea, every way the same. Secondly, wee haue it as immediately from Christ as they. I shew them both thus: The power of order is the power which inableth us to preach and deliver the whole counsell of God, and to minister all Sacraments sealing Gods covenant. Now unlesse we will with the Papists, say that preaching is no necessary *annexum* to the Presbyters office, or that his power is a rudimentall limited power, as to open the creed, Lords prayer, and commandements onely, or that he hath not the full power sacramentall, there being other sacraments of ordination and confirmation which we may not minister, all which are grosse, we must yeeld their power of order to be the same. Yea, were these sacraments properly, they are both grounded in the

power

power a Preſbyter hath: Ordination in *doe this in remembrance of me*: confirmation in power to baptize. The power being the ſame, it is happily in one immediately, and in the other by derivation from him. Nothing leſſe. All grant that Chriſt doth immediately giue it, even as the inward grace of every Sacrament commeth principally from him The Church, did ſhe giue this power, might make the ſacrament and preaching which one doth in order, no ſacrament, no preaching. The Pope doth not (if we follow the common tenent) callenge ſo much as to giue the power of order to any Biſhop or Prieſt whatſoever. If you ſay, the Preſbyter is ordained by the Biſhop, that is nothing: ſo is the Biſhop by other Biſhops, from whom notwithſtanding he receiveth not this power. We will take this as granted of all: though the truth is, all doe not maintaine it from right grounds. But it will be ſaid, the Preſbyter is inferiour in juriſdiction, and can haue none but what is derived to him from the Biſhop, who hath the fulneſſe of it within his Dioceſan Church. But this is falſe, and grounded on many falſe preſumptions. As firſt, that Miniſters of the Word are not properly and fully Paſtors; for to make a Paſtor, and giue him no help againſt the Wolfe, is to furniſh him forth imperfectly. Secondly, it preſuppoſeth the power of juriſdiction to be given originally and fontally to one perſon of the Church, and ſo to others, whereas Chriſt hath committed it *originaliter* & *exercitative* to the repreſentatiue Church, that they might Ariſtocratically adminiſter it. Thirdly, this preſuppoſeth the plenitude of regiment to be in the Biſhop, and from him to be derived to other: which maketh him a head of virtuall influence, that in his Church, which the Pope doth challenge in regard of all Biſhops. For his headſhip and ſpirituall ſoveraignitie ſtandeth according to *Bellarmine* in this, that the government of all *in foro externo*, is committed to him. Not to mention, how Biſhops, while they were Biſhops gloried of their chaire and teaching, as the flower of their garland, preferring it farre before government, but when they were fallen from their ſpirituall felicitie, and infected with ſecular ſmoke, then they recommended the labour of teaching to the Preſbyters, then their juriſdiction and conſiſtorie did carie all the credite, everie office in the Church being counted a dignitie, as it had more or leſſe juriſdiction annexed; as thoſe are more or leſſe honourable in the Common-wealth, which haue civill authoritie in leſſe or greater meaſure conjoyned. The truth is, it cannot be ſhewed that God ever made Paſtor without this juriſdiction; for whether it do agree to men as they are Paſtors, or as they are Prelats in the Church, it cannot be avoided but that the Paſtor ſhould haue it, becauſe though everie *Præſul* or *Prælatus*, be not a Paſtor, yet everie Paſtor is *Prælatus*, in order to that Church where he is the proper

and ordinarie Pastor. Yea, when censure is the most sharp spirituall medicine, it were ill with everie Church, if he who is resident alwaies among them as their spirituall Phisitian, should not haue power in administring it. Thirdly, I say, no Minister hath majoritie of power in applying the power of order or jurisdiction to this or that person. In the application there is a Ministerie of the Church interposed: but so that Christ onely is the cause with power, not onely why Presbyters are in the Church, but why *Thomas* or *Iohn* is chosen to and bestowed on this or that place. A Maister onely doth out of power take everie servant into his house: so God in his. God did chose *Aarons* sonns with the Levites, and Christ the 70, not mediately leaving it to the arbitrement of any to set out those that should stand before him. God doth ever onely in regard of authoritie, applie all power Ecclesiasticall to everie particular person, his sole authoritie doth it, though sometime as in ordinarie callings, the ministerie of others doth concurre. The Church is in setting out, or ordaining this or that man, as the Colledge is in chooſing, when shee taketh the man whom the statute of her founder doth most manifestly describe, or where the Kings mandate doth strictly injoyne, it would otherwise bring an imperiall power into the Church. For though many Kings cannot hinder but that there shall be such and such officers, and places of governement as are in their Kingdom, yet while they are free at their pleasure to depute this or that man to the places vacant, they haue a Kingly jurisdiction in them. Briefly, God doth ever apply the power Ecclesiasticall unto the person: sometime alone by himselfe, as in the Apostles, and then he doth it *tam immediatione suppositi quam virtutis*: sometime the ministerie of man concurring extraordinarily, as when God extraordinarilie directeth a person to goe and call one to this or that place, as he did *Samuel* to annoint *Saul*. Or else ordinarily, when God doth by his Writ and Spirit, guide men to take any to this or that place in his Church, which he doth partly by his written statutes, and partly by his Spirit: and thus he doth make the application onely *immediatione virtutis*, not *suppositi*.

Ob. But yet Bishops haue the Churches, & the care of them wholly committed to them: though therfore Ministers haue equall power to them, yet they cannot without their leaue haue any place within their Churches, and therefore are inferiour, in as much as the people with whom they exercise their power of order and jurisdiction, are assigned to them by the Bishop the proper Pastor of them. This is an errour likewise: For God doth make no Minister to whom hee doth not assigne a flock which hee may attend. God calleth Ministers, not to a faculrie of honour, which doth qualifie them with power to ministeriall actions, if any giue them persons among whom they

they may exerciſe their power received, as the Emperours did make *Chartularios Judices*, who had a power to judge cauſes if any would ſubject himſelfe to them. Or as the Count Palatine hath ordinarie Iudges, who are *habitu tantum judices*, having none under them, amongſt whom they may exerciſe juriſdiction. Or as the univerſity giveth the degree of a Doctor in Phyſick, without any patients among whom hee may practiſe. But Gods Miniſterie is the calling of a man to an actuall adminiſtration, *Goe teach*: and the power of order is nothing by the way, but a relatiue reſpect, founded in this, that I am called to ſuch an actuall adminiſtration. Now there cannot be an act commanded, without the ſubject about which it is occupied: otherwiſe, God ſhould giue them a faculty of feeding, and leaue them depending on others for ſheep to feed; God ſhould make them but remote potentiall Miniſters, and the Biſhop actuall. Thirdly, the Holy Ghoſt is ſaid to haue ſet the Preſbyters over their flock. A man taking a ſteward, or other ſervant into his houſe, doth giue him a power of doing ſomething to his familie; and never thinketh of taking ſervants, further then the neceſſitie of his houſhold doth require: ſo is it with God in his Church, which is his houſe: fore the exigency of his people ſo require, he doth not cal any to the function of Miniſterie. Again, this is enough to ground the authoritie which Antichriſt aſſumeth: For ſome make his ſoveraignetie to ſtand onely in this, not that he giveth order or power of juriſdiction, but that he giveth to all Paſtors & Biſhops the moytie of ſheep, on whom this their power is exerciſed, Chriſt having given him the care of all his ſheep, *feed my ſheep*. ſo *Vaſquez*. Thus if a Biſhop challenge all the ſheep in a Dioceſan flock to be his, & that he hath power to aſſigne the ſeverall flocks under him, he doth uſurp an Antichriſtian authoritie. Finally, if the Churches be the Biſhops through the Dioceſſe, Miniſters then are under them in their Churches, but as a curate is, whom a Parſon giveth leaue to help within his Church. Yea, they ſhould looſe their right in their Churches, when the Biſhop dyeth, as a Curate doth when the Parſon of this or that Church, whom he aſſiſted, is once departed. To conclude, they are not dependant (one Miniſter I meane on another) in the exerciſe and uſe of their calling. A ſervant that hath any place, doth know from his Maiſter what belongeth to it. The Prieſts and Levites had ſet downe what belonged to their places, as well as the high Prieſt what belonged to his. Againe, God hath deſcribed the Preſbyters office, as amply as any other. A Legate dependeth on none for inſtructions, but on him that ſendeth him; now everie Miniſter is an Embaſſadour of Chriſt. By their reaſon a Miniſter ſhould be accountant to man for what he did in his Miniſterie, if his exerciſing of it did depend on man. Then alſo

should ministers mediatly only serue God, inasmuch as they haue done this or that, to which the Bishop did direct them. Moreover, should the Bishop bid him not preach at all, preach rarely, teach onely such and such things, or come and liue from his charge, he should not sin in obeying him. But man cannot limit that power of ministerie which he cannot giue. It is not with Gods servants in his Church, as with civill servants in the Common-wealth: for here some servants are aboue others whom they command as they will, such as are called *servi ordinarii* or *præpositi*, some are under others to doe this or that commanded by them, commonly called *servi vicarii*: but in the Church all servants serue their Maister Christ, neither having any that they can command, nor being under any but Christ so as to be commanded by them. But it may be obiected, that God hath ordained some to be helps and assistants to othersome It is sayd that God hath ordained powers, helps, governours, 1.Cor.12.8. and were not the Euangelists assistants to the Apostles, doing that to which they directed them? To this I answer, that the helps God hath put in his Church respect the calling of Deacons, and such as ministred to the infirme ones: As for Euangelists, they were companions and assistants to the Apostles, but it was in order to the work of God in their hands, which they were to serue, not in order to their persons, as if they had been subiected to them in any servile inferioritie. Obserue how *Paul* speaketh of them 2.*Cor*.8.23. *Titus* was his companion and helper towards them, *Phil*.2.25. *Epaphroditus* was his brother and helper in his work, and fellow souldier, 1.*Thess*.3.2. *Timothie* was his coadiutor in the Gospell of Christ, 2.*Tim*.4.11. *Marke* was helpefull in the Ministerie. The truth is, this was *seruitus non personalis sed realis*; the Euangelists did serue the work the Apostles had in hand, without being servants to their persons. When brickelayers worke, some mixe lime, and make mortar, some beare up tile and mortar, some sit on the house and there lay that which is brought them. These are all fellow servants, yet the one doth serve to set forward the work of the other. But were they not left to the direction of the Apostles, wholly in exercise of their calling? I answer, as Christ gaue some to be Euangelists, so he made them know from himselfe what belonged to their office, and what was the administration to which he called them. Hee did not therefore wholly leaue them to the direction of any. There is a double direction, one *potestatiua*, which is made from majoritie of rule *ex αὐθεντίᾳ*, the other *socialis*, such as one servant, having fit knowledge of his maisters will, and ripe experience, may giue to another. The latter kinde of direction it was, not the former, by which the Euangelists were directed. Which though commonly *Paul* used, yet not so universally but that they went sometime of their owne accords

hither

hither and thither, as may bee gathered, 2. *Cor.* 8.16.17. and 2.7. 14.15.

The firſt Argument.

That which the Apoſtles had not over Prophets, Evangeliſts, Preſbyters, nor Deacons themſelves that power which the Church hath not over any member, the Biſhop hath not over other miniſters. But they had not over any inferior officers any majoritie of directive or corrective power: neither hath the Church it ſelfe any ſuch power. Ergo. The aſſumption is proved: For majoritie of directive and corrective power is a Lord-like and Regall power: now there is no ſuch power in the Church, or in the Apoſtles, or in any but onely in that one Lord: all other power being but a declarative and executive miniſterie to ſignifie and execute what Chriſt out of majoritie of power would have ſignified and put in execution.

The ſixth Argument.

That which doth breed an Antichriſtian uſurpation, never was of Chriſts inſtitution. But Biſhops Maioritie of power in regard of order and juriſdiction, doth ſo: Ergo. That which maketh the Biſhop a head as doth *influere* derive the power of externall government to other his aſſiſtents, that doth breed an Antichriſtian uſurpation. But to claime the whole power of juriſdiction through a Dioceſan Church, doth ſo: for he muſt needs ſubſtitute helpers to him, becauſe it is more then by himſelfe he can performe. But this is it which maketh Antichriſt, he doth take upon him to bee head of the whole Church from whom is derived this power of external government: and the Biſhop doth no leſſe in his Dioceſan Church, that which he uſurpeth differing in degree onely and extenſion, not in kind from that which the Pope arrogateth. If it bee ſaid that his power is Antichriſtian, becauſe it is univerſall: it is not ſo. For were the power lawfull, the univerſalitie could not make it Antichriſtian. The Apoſtles had an univerſalitie of authoritie, yet no Antichriſts, becauſe it did not make them heads, deriving to others from their fulneſſe: it was not prince-like majoritie of power, but ſteward like and miniſteriall onely. If one doe uſurpe a kingly power in Kent onelie, he were an Anti-king to our ſoveraigne, no leſſe for kind, then if he proclaimed himſelfe King of England, Scotland and Ireland. There is but one Lord, and manie miniſtrations. Neither doth this make the Popes power papall, becauſe it is not under a Synod: for the beſt of the Papiſts hold, and it is the moſt common tenent, that he is ſubject to an oecumenicall Councell. Secondlie, though he be ſubject, yet that doth not hinder but hee may uſurpe a kinglie government: for a King may haue a kinglie power, and yet confeſſe himſelfe accountable to all his people collectively conſidered.

red. Neither doth this make the Bishops lawfull in one Church, because one may manage it, and the Popes unlawfull, because none is sufficient to sway such a power through the whole Church: for then all the power the Pope doth challenge, is not *per se*, but *per accidens* unlawfull, by reason of mans unsufficiencie, who cannot weild so great a matter.

The seventh Argument.

Those ministers who are made by one parent in the same words, have equall authoritie: but all ministers of the word are made by the same patent, in the same words, *Receive the holy Ghost, whose sins ye forgive, &c.* Ergo. The proposition is denied: because the sence of the words is to be understood according as the persons give leave to whom they are spoken. These words spoken to Apostles, they gave them larger power then to a Bishop; and so spoken to a Presbyter they give him lesse power then to a Bishop. *Answer.* If the Scripture had distinguished of Presbyters Pastorall feeding with the word, and made them divers degrees, as it hath made Apostles and Evangelists, then wee would grant the exception: but the Scripture doth not know this division of Pastors and Doctors into chiefe and assistent: but speaketh of them as of Apostles and Evangelists, who were among themselves equall in degree. Wherefore as no Apostle received by these words greater power then another: so no Pastor or Teacher, but must receive the same power, as who are among themselves of the same degree. Secondlie, were they different degrees, yet it should give the Presbyter for kind, though not of so ample extent as the Bishop hath, as it giveth the Bishop the same power for kinde, which the Apostles had, though not so universall, but contracted to particular churches.

Now to come unto some conclusions or assertions which may lend light unto the deciding of this question.

Conclus. 1. Let this be the first. No minister of the word hath any power but ministeriall in the Church. Power is naturall or morall. Morall is Civill or Ecclesiastical. Civill is either Lord-like and ruling, or ministeriall and servile. So Ecclesiasticall, taken largelie for all power subjectivelie in, or objectivelie about the Church, is either Lord-like and Regall, such as is in Christ, or it is ministeriall and servile, such as is in the Church and the principall members of it. The power therfore of the Apostles themselves and Evangelists, is called διακονία, Act. 20. 1. Tim. 4. yea such a service, as doth make the ministers having it, so servants, that they are no way Lords. *Many ministers, one Lord: We preach Christ, our selves your servants for Jesus sake* S. *Paul* maketh his power steward-like, not regall. Now as that is regall power which doth any thing from the authoritie one hath in himselfe, or from ones pleasure: so that is ministeriall power

which

which doth nothing but eying the will and power of him that is principall: a power which ſignifieth or executeth this or that *ex mero alterius obſequio*.

Conſ. 2. This miniſteriall power is no ſupernaturall vertue or qualitie inherent in the ſoule: but a relative reſpect founded on this, that I am called by God to this or that actuall adminiſtration in his Church. For it is not a power ſimply, whereby a man is made able to doe ſome ſupernaturall act, which he could not before in any manner performe: but it is reſpectively ſayd a power, in as much as it doth inable him to doe thoſe acts in the Church of God lawfully, and *ex officio*, vvith vvhich before hee might not intermedle. The power of a Deacon, Paſtor, Evangeliſt, Apoſtle, belong to one predicament in regard of that which is the genus or common nature of them: the power of the Church cannot be other. Naturall and civill power doth vvith vertue and efficacie reach thoſe effects and ends to vvhich they are deſigned: becauſe they are proportioned to them, and exceed not their activitie: but Eccleſiaſtical power cannot thus concurre to the end and effects for which it is ordained: becauſe they are ſuch as the omnipotencie of God onely can produce, as the converting or creating grace in the heart of a ſinner, to vvhich no ſupernaturall vertue in man can by any reall, though inſtrumentarie, efficacie, conduce any thing.

Concluſ. 3. God hath not given miniſteriall power to any, vvhich himſelfe is not perſonally to diſcharge, nor in further plenitude then that by himſelfe it may be performed. The reaſon is, becauſe God cannot give one the charge of doing more then a mans proper induſtry can atchieve, but hee muſt withall put it in a mans power to take others, and to impart with them power of teaching and governing, ſo farre as may ſupply that defect which is in his ſtrength to performe it alone. Hee that will have the end, will have that vvithout vvhich the end cannot be attained. If God vvould have any one an univerſall paſtor to all the Churches of the vvorld, hee muſt needs allow him power to ſubſtitute Paſtors here and there, deriving unto them power both to teach and governe, ſo far as may ſupply his abſence in the Paſtorall care. If I will have one keep my flocks vvhich goe in ſo ſheep-gates, if I commit them them to one, I muſt needs together give him leave to aſſume unto himſelfe ſuch as may be under-ſheepheards to him. Thus if God giue a Biſhop the plenitude of Paſtorall care and government over all the Pariſhionall Churches through a Dioceſſe, hee muſt needs together allovv him this povver, of being a head of internall influence, even a head virtually communicating vvith others part of paſtorall power, vvhether teaching or government. Thus ſhould none but Biſhops be *in officio* ſervants in Paſtorall cure to God: all others ſhould bee

immc-

immediatly and formally ſervants to the Biſhop; and doe everie thing in the name of the Biſhop, being immediatly onely and in a remote ſenſe the ſervants of God: as in the former compariſon of one ſervant receiving from his maſter the care of all the flockes, he is the maſters ſervant to vvhom the maſter committeth the truſt, from vvhom he onely looketh to ſee it performed: but thoſe whom this ſheepheard taketh to himſelfe for his aide, they come under his dommion, and are ſervants to him. If it be ſayd, that God doth not thus make the Biſhop Paſtor, but that he will likewiſe that there be pariſh Paſtors under him, and helpes of government. To this I anſwer, if God will have them, then either after his own deſignement, or elſe leaving it to the Biſhops arbitrement: if hee leave it to the Biſhops arbitrement, then the objection before is in force, God will looke for the cure from him onely, he ſhall take according to his judgement, ſuch as may help him. If God will have them after his own deſignment, then he giveth the Biſhop no more Paſtorall power then he can diſcharge himſelfe, others having their right in all the Biſhop cannot execute, as well as the Biſhop, and as immediatly from Chriſt. Some write, as if the Apoſtles had the plenitude of all Paſtorall power, that from them it might be derived to the Church, it being ſeen through nature, that inferiour things receive influence from the ſuperiour. But they miſconceive the matter; they had only a power to ſerve the Church with the perſonall ſervice of their Apoſtleſhip. The Paſtorall power of Evangeliſts, or of ordinarie Paſtors and teachers, they never had. For as Chriſt gave the one order, ſo the two other alſo, for the gathering of the Saints, and exædifying of the body of Chriſt: and no perſon in any ranke had any power to do this or that in the Church further then himſelfe might performe in perſon The ſteward in a houſe hath ſul power of a ſteward, but not the power of all other officers, as Clark of the kitchin, Butler, Chamberlaine, &c. So in theſe divers orders of ſervants in Gods houſe, his Church If the Apoſtles had had the fulneſſe of Paſtorall cure, they ſhould then have ordained others Evangeliſts, and Paſtors not onely by miniſteriall mediation of their perſons calling them, but alſo by mediation of vertue.

Concluſ. 4. One miniſteriall power may bee in degree of dignitie aboue another. For the power of one may be about more noble acts then the power of another, or in the ſame kind, the power of one may be more extended, and the power of another more contracted. Thus the Deacons had for the obje& of their power and care, not ſo excellent a thing as that of Paſtors, Evangeliſts, and Apoſtles. Thus the power of ordinarie Paſtors was not ſo univerſall as the Apoſtles, even as in the orders of ſervants domeſticall, ſome are implied about leſſer, ſome about greater and more honorable ſubjects.

Concl.

Concl. 5. No order of Miniſters or ſervants can have majoritie of directive and corrective power over thoſe who are in inferiour order of miniſterie and ſervice. The reaſon is, becauſe this exceedeth the bounds of miniſteriall power, and is a participation of that deſpoticall power which is appropriate to the maſter of the familie.

Concl. 6. Servants in one degree may have power to ſignifie their maſters direction, and to execute miniſterially what their maſter out of his corrective power inflicteth on their fellow ſervants in other degrees. Thus Paſtors ſignifie Gods will to governing Preſbyters and Deacons, what he would have them to doe in their places. Thus the Apoſtles might informe all orders under them.

Concl. 7. This power miniſteriall tending to execute the pleaſure of Chriſts corrective power, was committed to ſome in extraordinary degrees, perſonally and ſingularly, and might be ſo in ſome caſes exerciſed by them. I mean ſingularitie without concurrence of any others. This without doubt was in the Apoſtles and Euangeliſts: and it was needfull it ſhould bee ſo: firſt, becauſe it might be behovefull there to excommunicate where as yet Churches were not riſen to their perfect frame: ſecondly, becauſe there might be ſome perſons not ſetled as fixed dwellers in any Church, whom yet to be caſt forth was very behovefull. Againe, ſome Evangeliſts might incurre cenſure, as *Demas*, in ſuch ſort as no ordinary Churches power could reach to them.

Concl. 8. That ordinarily this power is not given to any one ſingularly by himſelfe to exerciſe the ſame, but with the companie of others conſtituting a repreſentative Church: which is the poynt next to bee ſhewed. Yea where Churches were conſtituted, the Apoſtles did not offer to exerciſe their power, without the miniſteriall concurrence of the Churches, as in the ſtorie of the Corinthians is manifeſt.

THE THIRD QVESTION,

Whether Christ did immediatly commit ordinarie power Ecclesiasticall, and the exercise of it, to any one singular person, or to a vnited multitude of Presbyters.

THough this question is so coincident with the former, that the grounds hath in a sort been discussed: yet for some new considerations which may bee super-added, wee will briefly handle it in the Method premised.

First, it is argued for the affirmative.

Argum. 1. That which is committed to the Church, is committed to the principal member of the Church But exercise of iurisdiction was comitted to the Church, *Mat.* 18. 17. Ergo. Either to the whole Church, or to a Church in the Church, or to some one eminent member in the Church. But it was not committed to bee exercised by the whole Church, or to any Church in the Church. Ergo, to one who is in effect as the church, having all the authority of it. Secondly, if one person may be representativly a Church, when jurisdiction is promised; then one person may be representatiuly a church when jurisdiction and power of exercising is committed. But one singular person, *Peter* signified the Church, when the promise of iurisdiction is made. Ergo. *Cyprian* to *Iubais* sayth, that the Bishop is in the Church, and the Church so in the Bishop, that they cannot bee severed. Finally, as the kingdome of England may bee put for the King in whom is all the power of the kingdome: So the Church for the chiefe governour in whom is the power of it.

The second Argument.

That which the Churches had not given them when they were constituted, that was not promised to them as their immediat right. But they had not coercive power given them when they were constituted. Ergo, Christ did not commit it to the Churches or Presbyters

byters. For then the Apoſtles would not have withheld it from theſe. But they did. For the Apoſtles kept it with themſelves. As in the inceſtuous Corinthian is manifeſt, whom *Paul* by his iudgement was faine to excommunicate. And the Theſſalonians are bid to note the inordinate, and ſignifie them, as not having power within themſelves to cenſure them. And ſo *Paul* alone excommunicated *Hymenæus* and *Alexander*.

The third Argument.

That which *Paul* committed to ſome prime men in Churches, and their ſucceſſours, that was not committed to Preſbyteries, but ſingular perſons. But in power of ordination and iuriſdiction, he did ſo. For to *Timothy* in Epheſus, and to *Titus* in Crete, he commended the power and exerciſe of it. Ergo.

The fourth Argument.

That order which was moſt fit for exerciſing power of iuriſdiction, that Chriſt did ordain. But the order of one chiefe governour is fitter for execution, then the order of a united multitude. Ergo.

The fift Argument.

If all authoritie and power of exerciſe be in the Church originally, then the Paſtors derive their power from the Church. But this is not true. Ergo, it was not committed to the Church. That authoritie which the Church never had, ſhe cannot convey. But the Paſtorall authoritie of word and Sacraments never was in the Church eſſentially taken. Ergo, it cannot be derived from her. Againe, Paſtours ſhould diſcharge their office in the name of the Church, did they receive their power from the Church.

The ſixth Argument.

If the power of iuriſdiction and execution bee committed from Chriſt to the Church, then hath the Church ſupreame power. Then may a particular Church depoſe her Biſhop, the ſheepe cenſure the ſhepheard, children their fathers, which is abſurd.

On the other ſide it is argued,

Argum. 1. That which Chriſt doth preſuppoſe as being in many, and to be exerciſed by many, that never was committed by Chriſt to one, and the execution of any one. But *Matth.* 18. Chriſt doth manifeſtly ſuppoſe the power of iuriſdiction to be in many, and that *exercitativè*, ſo as by them being many, is it to be exerciſed. Ergo. Now this is plain in the place. Where firſt marke, that Chriſt doth preſuppoſe the authoritie of every particular Church taken indiſtinctly. For it is ſuch a Church as any brother offended may preſently complaine to. Therefore no univerſall, or provinciall, or Dioceſan Church gathered in a Councell. Secondly, it is not any particular Church that he doth ſend all Chriſtians to, for then all Chriſtians in the world ſhould come to one perticular Church, were

it poſſible. He doth therefore preſuppoſe indiſtinctly the very particular Church where the brother offending and offended are members. And if they be not both of one church, the plaintife muſt make his denuntiation to the Church where the defendant is, *quia forum ſequitur reum*. Thirdly, as Chriſt doth ſpeak it of any ordinarie particular Church indiſtinctly, ſo he doth by the name of Church not underſtand eſſentially all the congregation. For then Chriſt ſhould give not ſome, but all the members of the Church to be governors of it. Fourthly, Chriſt ſpeaketh it of ſuch a Church to whom wee may ordinarily and orderlie complaine: now this we cannot to the whole multitude. Fiftly, this Church he ſpeaketh of, he doth preſuppoſe it as the ordinarie executioner of all diſcipline and cenſure. But the multitude have not this execution ordinarie, as all but *Morelius*, and ſuch Democritall ſpirits doe affirme. And the reaſon ratifying the ſentence of the Church, doth ſhew that often the number of it is but ſmall: *For where two or three are gathered together in my name* Whereas the Church or congregations eſſentiallie taken for teachers and people, are incomparably great. Neither doth Chriſt meane by Church, the chiefe Paſtor, who is virtuallie as the whole Church. For firſt, the word Church doth ever ſignifie a company, and never is found to note out one perſon. Secondlie, the Biſhop may be the perſon offending or offended, and the Church to which he muſt bring the matter, muſt be other then himſelfe. Thirdlie, the gradation doth ſhew it. First, by thy ſelfe, *Then ſhew a witnes or two. Then to the Church*, as the ſinne increaſeth, the number of thoſe by whom it is to be rebuked and cenſured, increaſeth alſo. If one ſay, though the Church ſignifie one governour, yet the gradation holdeth, for to tell it to the governour in open Court, is more then to tell it to twentie. Wee grant that this is true, and were the word Church taken here to note ſome eminent governour, it might be brought in as a further degree, though one onely were enforced. But how can *Peter* be complainaint, if *Peter* the Præſul onely be the iudge to whom the thing muſt be denounced. Fourthlie, the church in the Corinthians which *Paul* ſtirreth up to cenſure the inceſtuous perſon, was not any one but many. Their rebuke upon which it is like hee repented, was a rebuke of many, 2. *Cor.* 2. 6. Fiftly, if the church had been one, he would not have ſubjoined: *for what ye ſhall bind on earth, ſhall be bound in heaven*. Sixtly, if the church did not note an aſſembly, how could he aſſure them from hence, *that God would do what they agreed on, becauſe he was with the leaſt aſſemblies gathered in his name*. Vnleſſe the Church meant were an aſſemblie, this argument could not be ſo correſpondent. Where two or two or three are aſſembled in Gods name, God is in the midſt of them to doe that they agree on. But where the Church is binding or looſing, there

are

are ſome aſſembled in the name of Chriſt. Ergo. Laſtly, the church in the old Teſtament never noteth the high Prieſt virtuallie, but an aſſemblie of Prieſts ſitting together, as iudges in the cauſes of God. Wherefore as Chriſt doth indiſtinctlie preſuppoſe everie particular Church. So he doth here onely preſuppoſe the joynt authoritie, & joynt execution of a repreſentative Church, a Preſbyterie of Elders who were Paſtors and Governours.

Argum. 4. Wee argue from the practiſe of the Churches. That power which is not in one, nor to be exerciſed by one, but in many, and to be exerciſed by many in the Church of the Corinthians, that power with the exerciſe of it, was committed by Chriſt to many, not to one. But the power of Eccleſiaſticall cenſure was in many, and to be performed by many aſſembled. Ergo. The propoſition is plaine. For *Paul* would not have called for, nor have liked any conſtitution or exerciſe of power Eccleſiaſticall, other then Chriſt had ordained. The aſſertion is denied by ſome: but it is a plain truth by many invincible arguments. For firſt, *Paul* doth rebuke them that they had not ſet themſelves to caſt him forth. Now (as *Ambroſe* ſaith on the place. *Si autem quis poteſtatem non habet, quem ſcit reum abjicere, aut probare non valet, immunis eſt.* Secondlie, *Paul* doth wiſh them aſſembled together, with himſelfe in the name and vertue of Chriſt, that they might deliver him up to Sathan. For he doth not call on them to reſtrain him him as already excommunicated, but to purge him out as an infectuous leaven yet amongſt them. Thirdlie, *Paul* doth tell them that they had power to judge thoſe within, thoſe who were called brethren, and lived otherwiſe. Fourthly, *Paul* doth tell them that they did a rebuke or mulct of many, writing to them that they would not proceed, 2. *Cor.* 2. 6. Laſtly, *Paul* doth attribute power to them to forgive him, and to receive him to the peace of the church. Which would not have been in them, had they not had the power to excommunicate. Such as have no power to bind, have no power to looſe. So it might be proved by the Church of the Theſſalonians, 2. *Theſſ.* 3. 14. *If any man walk inorninatly, note him, that others may refraine him.* Noting, being not a ſignification by letter, which doth wreſt the word againſt all copies, and the current of all Greek interpreters: but judicially to note him, that all may avoyd him; that is, excomunicate him. Finallie, the churches of Aſia, as it is plain, had power of government within themſelves.

Argum. 3. That power which the Apoſtles did not exerciſe in the Churches, nor Evangeliſts, but with concurrence of the Churches and Preſbyteries, that power is much leſſe to be exerciſed by any ordinary Paſtour, but by manie. But they did not ordaine, nor lay on hands alone, they did not determine queſtions by the power of the keyes alone, but with cocurrence of the Preſbyters of the Church. Ergo, much leſſe may any ordinarie

miniſter doe it alone. *Timothy* received grace by the χειροθεσία of the Preſbyterie. For that Perſons muſt bee underſtood here is apparant by the like place; when it is ſaid, by the laying on of my hands, μετὰ noteth a perſon, and ſo here a Preſbyterie. Secondly, to take πρεσβυτέριον to ſignifie the order of Prieſthood, is againſt all Lexicons, and the nature of the Greeke termination. Thirdly, *Timothy* neuer received that order of a Preſbyter, as before we have proved. Fourthly, it cannot ſignifie as Greeke Expoſiters take it, a company of Biſhops. For neither was that Canon of 3 Biſhops, and the Metropolitan, or all the Biſhops in a Province, in the Apoſtles time, neither were theſe who are now called Biſhops, then called Preſbyters, as they ſay, but Apoſtles, men that had received Apoſtolick grace, Angels, &c. Finally, it is very abſurd to think of cõpanies of other Preſbyters in Churches then *Paul* planted; but hee placed Preſbyteries of ſuch Preſbyters as are now diſtinguiſhed from Biſhops, which is the grant of our adverſaries. Not to mention how *Armachanus* doth cenſure the other as an interpretation from ones privat ſence, beſides teſtimonie of Scripture.

Thus the Apoſtles did not offer alone to determine the queſtion Act. 15. but had the joynt ſuffrages of the Preſbyterie with them. Not becauſe they could not alone haue infallibly anſwered, but becauſe it was a thing to be determined by many; all who had received power of the keyes, doing it *ex officio*, and others from diſcretion and dutie of confeſſion the truth. Yea the Biſhops called *primi Preſbyteri*, had no ordination at the firſt which the Preſbyterie did not give them. Whence have Biſhops of other Churches power to miniſter the ſacrament to the Biſhop of this Church? But *Timothy* and *Titus* are ſayd to have ordained miniſters. As Conſuls and Dictators are ſayd to have created Conſuls, becauſe they called Senates, propounded and together with others did it. No otherwiſe doe Ieſuits themſelves underſtand it. *Salmeron* on the firſt of *Titus*, *&c.* And it is manifeſt by Eccleſiaſticall writings of all ſorts, that Preſbyters had right of ſuffrage, not onely in their owne Preſbyteries, but in Provinciall Synods, and therfore in Oecumenicall Synods, which doth ariſe from a combination of the other, to which their mindes went in the inſtruction of Biſhops received from their Churches. And *Athanaſius* yet a Deacon, is read to haue been at the Councell of Nice, and to have had right of ſuffrage in it. Finally, the Preſbyteries did a long time execute joyntly all actions of Church government, as is before declared. Other arguments we ſhall touch in anſwer of theſe which have been objected. Now to come to the concluſions, let this be firſt.

Concluſ. 1. Extraordinarie power was committed to ſome ſingu-

lar

lar persons, so that in some case they might singularly exercise it without concurrence of other. This I speak in regard of Apostles and Evangelists, whose power in many things could not have concurrence of particular Churches, which in the former question is sufficiently declared.

Conclus. 2. That ordinarie power, and the execution thereof was not committed to any singular governors; whereof there was to be one onely in each Church. This is against the Iesuits, who make account (the most of them) that as all civill power of government is given to kings to be executed by them within their commonwealth, so Ecclesiasticall power (say they) is given to the Pope and to Bishops in their particular Churches to be executed by them, and derived from them to the whole Church.

Conclus. 3. Ordinarie power with the execution thereof, was not given to the communitie of the Church, or to the whole multitude of the faithfull, so that they were the immediate and first receptacle, receiving it from Christ, and virtually deriving it to others. This I set downe against the Divines of Constance; our prime Divines, as *Luther* and *Melancthon*, and the Sorbonists, who doe maintaine it at this day. Yea this seemeth to have been *Tertullians* errour; for in his booke: *de pudicitia*, he maketh Christ to haue left all Christians with like power, but the Church for her honor, did dispose it as we see. The proportion of a pollitick body, and naturall, deceived them, while they will apply all that is in these to Christs mysticall body, not remembring that *analogon* is not *in omni simile*, for then should should it be the same with the *analogatum*. True it is, all civill power is in the body politicke, the collections of subjects, then in a King from them; And all the power of hearing, seeing, they are in the whole man, which doth produce them effectually, though formally and instrumentally they are in the eare and eye. But the reason of this is, because these powers are naturall, and what ever is naturall, doth first agree to the communitie or *totum*, and afterward to a particular person and part, but all that is in this body, cannot hold in Christs mysticall body. In a politick body, power is first in the communitie, in the King from them, but all Ecclesiasticall power is first in our King before any in the Church from him. But to whom should he first commit this power, but to his Queene. *Answ.* Considering this power is not any Lordly power, but a power of doing service to the Church for Christ his sake. Therfore it is fit it should be committed to some persons, and not to the whole communitie which are the Queen of Christ. For it is not fit a King should commit power to his Queene to serve herselfe properly: but to haue persons who in regard of this relation should stand distinguished from her. Secondly, in naturall bodies, the power of seeing is first

immediatly

immediatly in the man, from the man in the eye and particular members: In the myſticall body, the faith of a beleever is not firſt immediatly in all, then in the beleever, but firſt of all and immediatly in the perſonall beleever, for whoſe good it ſerveth more properly then for the whole, every man being to live by his own faith. The power of Prieſthood was not firſt in the Church of Iſraell, ſo derived to the Prieſt: but immediatly from Chriſt ſeated in *Aaron* and his ſonnes. *Obiect.* Yea they were given the Church *intuitu eiuſdem tanquam finis & totius.* *Anſw.* I but this is not enough, that power may be ſayd to be immediatly received by the Church as the firſt receptacle of it, and from it derived to others, as the power of ſeeing is not onely given *intuitu hominis* as the end of it, and the *totum* to whom it agreeth, but is *in homine* as the firſt ſubiect from whom it commeth to the eye. But the power even of ordinary miniſters is not in the Church. For as all are ſayd not to have been Apoſtles, ſo not to have been Doctors. But if the power of ordinarie teaching had been given to every beleever, all ſhould have been made Doctors, though not to continue ſo in exerciſing the power. Secondly, were the power in the Church, the Church ſhould not onely call them, but make them out of vertue and power received into her ſelfe: then ſhould the Church have a true Lordlike power in regard of her miniſters. Beſides, there are many in the communitie of Chriſtians uncapable of this power regularly, as women and children. This concluſion in my judgment *Victoria, Soto* &others deny, with greater ſtrength of reaſon then the contrary is maintained.

Concluſ. 4. Fourthly, ordinary power of miniſteriall government is committed with the execution of it, to the Senat or Preſbyterie of the Church. If any faile in any office, the Church hath not power of ſupplying that, but a miniſtery of calling one whom Chriſt hath deſcribed, that from Chriſt he may have power of office given him in the place vacant.

Concluſ. 5. Laſtly, though the communitie have not power given her, yet ſuch eſtate by Chriſt her huſband is put on her, that all power is to be executed in ſuch manner, as ſtandeth with reſpect to her excellencie. Hence it is, that the governours are in many things of greater moment to take the conſent of the people with them. Not that they have ioynt power of the keyes with them, but becauſe they ſuſtaine the perſon of the ſpouſe of Chriſt, and therefore cannot be otherwiſe dealt with, without open diſhonor in ſuch things, which belong in common to the whole congregation.

Now to anſwer the arguments firſt propounded.

The Propoſition of the firſt Syllogiſme is denyed. *That that was committed to the Church was committed to ſome principall member.* And we deny the ſecond part of the next Syllogiſme, proving this part

denyed.

denyed. *For the power and execution was committed to a Church in a Church.* Which is ſo farre from abſurditie, that he is abſurd who doth not ſee it in Civill and Sacred. Doe we not ſee in Parliament a repreſentatiue Common-wealth within our Common-wealth, having the greateſt authority? Not to mention that a Church within a Church ſhould not be ſtrange to them who imagine many Pariſhionall Churches within one Dioceſan Church. To the proofes which prevent as it were an objection, ſhewing that the Church, *Math.* 18. 17. may be put for one chiefe Governour.

The propoſition is denyed. *If that Peter one Governour, may be in type and figure the Church to whom the juriſdiction is promiſed, then the Church receiving and executing it may be one.* A moſt falſe Propoſition whoſe contrary is true. The reaſon is, becauſe the Church typified by *Peter* is properly and really a Church, not figuratiuely and improperly: for then *Peter* ſhould haue bene a figure or type, of a type or figuratiue Church. The figure therfore and type being of the Church which is properly taken, and the Church properly and really taken, being a company aſſembled, hence it is that (*Math.* 18. 17.) the Church cannot ſignifie one; for one is but fignratiuely and improperly a Church. There is not the ſame reaſon of the figure and the thing that is figured. Nay hence an Argument may be retorted, proving that by that Church whereof *Peter* was a figure, is not meant one chiefe Governour. *Peter* as one man or Governour was properly and really a virtuall Church and chiefe Governour. But *Peter* as one man and Governour was in figure onely the Church. *Math.* 18. Ergo, that Church *Math.* 18. is not a virtuall Church, noting forth one chiefe Governour onely. As for *Cyprians* ſpeech, it doth nothing but ſhew the conjunction of Paſtor and people by mutuall loue, which is ſo ſtreight that the one cannot be ſchiſmatically left out, but the other is forſaken alſo. Otherwiſe I thinke it cannot be ſhewed to the time of *Innocentius* 3. that the Biſhop was counted the Church; or this dreame of a virtuall Church once imagined. The Clerkes of the Church of *Placentia* did in their oath of canonicall obedience ſweare thus: *That they would obey the Church of Placentia, and the Lord their Biſhop.* Where the Chapiter doth carrie the name of the Church from the Biſhop. Yea, even in thoſe times prepoſed, or ſet before him, when the Pope was lifted up aboue generall Councels, then it is like was the firſt nativity of theſe virtuall Churches. As for a Kingdom I doubt not, but it may be put for a King figuratiuely: but the Church typified by *Peter*, muſt needs be a Church properly. And it will never be proved that any one Governour was ſet up in a Church proportionable to a King in a Common-wealth, in whom is all civill power wherby the whole Kingdom is adminiſtred.